P 15-50
106-169

BX830
.C3
V.15

15-50; 106-193

THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY CENTURIES

THE CATHOLIC LIBRARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

Translated from the French

PRELIMINARY LIST

Baptism and Confirmation. Rev. A. D'Alès, S.J.

The Breviary. Its History and Contents. Dom Baudot, O.S.B.

The Church in Modern Times, 1447-1789. Canon Léman.

The Cradle of the Bible. The Geology and Geography of Palestine. Mgr. Legendre.

The Moral Law of the Family. P. Méline.

The Last Things. Abbé A. Michel.

St. Paul. Abbé Tricot.

The Papacy. Abbé F. Mourret.

Holiness in the Church. R. Plus, S.J.

The Foundations of Thomistic Philosophy. R. P. Sertillanges, O.P.

Greek Literature in the Early Church. Abbé G. Bardy.

The Christian Latin Literature of the First Six Centuries. Abbé G. Bardy.

The Congregations of Priests, XVI—XVIII Century. Canon Pisani.

The Church of the Early Centuries. Abbé Amann.

The Theology of the New Testament. R. P. Lemonnyer, O.P.

Pastors and People. Canon Magnin.

Religious Music. Abbé Aigrain.

Mediæval Spirituality. Abbé Vernet.

Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge

XV

The Church of the Early Centuries

BY

PROFESSOR AMANN

TRANSLATED BY

E. RAYBOULD, PH.D.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

SANDS & CO.
15 King Street, Covent Garden, London

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
15 & 17 South Broadway
St. Louis, Mo.

Nihil Obstat

JOANNES GRAY,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur

✠ANDREAS JOSEPH, O.S.B.,
Archiep. S. Andr. et Edimb.

EDIMBURGI,
die 18 Maii, 1930.

160045

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
NORTHUMBERLAND PRESS LIMITED, NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I

THE CHURCH AND THE PAGAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER I

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

The Church of Jerusalem—The Diffusion of Christianity in the East—In the West 15

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE: THE PERSECUTIONS

General Causes of Persecution—Spontaneous Persecution—The Edict of Trajan—The Persecutions of the Third Century 32

CHAPTER III

THE INTERIOR LIFE OF THE CHURCH

The Ecclesiastical Constitution — The Church of Rome—Mission of the Church—The Teaching of the Church—The Sacraments 51

CONTENTS

CHAPTER IV

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES

PAGE

Heresies—Gnosticism—Marcionism—The Trinitarian Controversy—Montanism—The Novatians—The Dispute about Baptism 77

CHAPTER V

THE FINAL CRISIS. THE GREAT PERSECUTION. THE PEACE OF CONSTANTINE

The Great Persecution—The Edict of Milan . . 106

PART II

THE CHURCH AND THE CHRISTIAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER I

CHRISTIANITY AS THE RELIGION OF THE STATE

Constantine—The Sons of Constantine—Julian the Apostate—Valentinian and Valens—Gratian and Theodosius 117

CHAPTER II

THE ROMAN STATE AND THE RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

The Donatist Schism—The Trinitarian Conflict in the Second Half of the Third Century—Arius and the Council of Nicæa—The anti-Nicene Movement—The Restoration of Orthodoxy . . 133

CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

THE WEST ON THE EVE OF THE INVASIONS

PAGE

Rome—Northern Italy—Gaul and Britain—Spain—Africa—Donatism—Pelagianism . . . 170

CHAPTER IV

THE EAST IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

The Church of the East—The Origenist Disputes—Nestorianism—Monophysitism . . . 194

CHAPTER V

THE ORIENTAL SCHISMS AND THE EFFORT TOWARDS REUNION (SIXTH AND SEVENTH CENTURIES)

The Nestorian Church—The anti-Chalcedon Agitation—The Henotikon of Zeno—The Quarrel of the Three Chapters—Monothelitism . . . 216

THE CHURCH OF THE EARLY CENTURIES

INTRODUCTION

In the eyes of the historian the Church first appears as a pious brotherhood, born in the heart of Judaism, made up of a small but ever increasing number of Jews, who, recognising in Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah, hailed Him as such. Faithful to the last words of their Master, the first disciples addressed themselves first to their compatriots. But soon, alas! they were forced to recognise that the conversion of the mass of the Jewish people would prove a long and difficult task. The same obstacles which had harassed the career of Jesus rendered but too often fruitless the preaching of His apostles. Were it necessary, before addressing the Gentiles, to wait till Jerusalem, Judea, and Samaria were converted, the conquest of the nations which the Master had formally confided to them would run the risk of being indefinitely postponed. They were not to be held back by such a prospect, and but a short time after the ascension of Christ, the gospel had already penetrated into the civilisation of Greece and Rome.

5 D

St Paul more than any other contributed to bring home to the workers of that first hour how imperiously necessary it was for the new religion to renounce those narrower horizons beyond which some of its followers hardly dared to venture. In the year 59, when he arrived in Rome to defend himself before the Imperial tribunal, against the accusations brought against the Jews, he had already crossed Asia Minor several times, had visited Macedonia and Greece, and established Christian communities in the principal towns of the Roman East. He had also made plans for going to Spain and for exploring the most distant countries of the West, but his forced sojourn in Rome was of considerable importance for the future of Christianity.

In the meantime some of the apostles had gone from Palestine to Asia Minor, where they found churches already established by Paul. This was the case of St Peter, who, after having passed some time in Anatolia, also took the road for Rome. It was the case of St John, who, surrounded by veneration, carried on his ministry in proconsular Asia until the beginning of the second century. He too, if we are to believe an old tradition, was acquainted with Rome. We can safely say that in the last decades of the first century Christianity had penetrated into the great cities of the Empire, in a more marked degree in the East, but quite noticeably in the West also.

The Roman Empire was in truth the political entity at that moment most likely to attract the attention of the Jews of Palestine. Curiously enough it was not towards the countries east of the Euphrates, where it would seem the new religion

could have found special facilities for propaganda, that the most celebrated of the apostles directed their efforts. It was the West, it was Rome, the capital of the Empire, that called. Christianity, rooted as it was in Jewish soil and supported in its first beginnings by the Jews, was yet destined to take its own particular physiognomy and to develop its own peculiar characteristics in the midst of the Roman Empire and in contact with Roman and Hellenic civilisation.

The boundaries of this immense Empire at the beginning of the Christian era are roughly known to all. Its principal towns were grouped around the Mediterranean, but from the shores of this sea Roman dominion advanced in all directions until stopped by natural frontiers. From the straits of Gibraltar to the Pas de Calais the ocean formed such a boundary. But the Channel had been crossed and Roman territory extended to the Scottish hills. From the mouth of the Rhine to that of the Danube, the line of demarcation separating the Empire from the chaos of the Teutonic tribes followed more or less the course of these two rivers. For a short period it even passed beyond. From the mouth of the Danube the frontier followed the western and southern shores of the Black Sea, then ran along the southern spurs of the Caucasus and finally reached the source of the Euphrates. The middle course of this river practically formed the eastern boundary of the Empire. From the point where the river turns definitely eastwards a belt of deserts protected the more southern portion of the Empire. The Arabian desert, the Libian desert, the Sahara itself assured relative security to Syria, Egypt, Cyrene and to the magnificent Roman province of

Africa, corresponding to Tunis, Algeria and the northern part of Morocco as we know them. The Mediterranean, a mere Roman lake, was the link which bound together these diverse provinces and assured unity. An admirable network of highroads everywhere connected the coast of this sea with the hinterland. To the South and the West deserts and ocean formed insurmountable barriers. It was only in the North and the East that the Roman peace was menaced. Behind the Rhine and the Danube the Germans were stirring. During the four centuries that the Empire was still to exist, extended as we have described it, ceaseless efforts would have to be made constantly to strengthen that dam in the North which often enough showed signs of breaking. It was from this side that the real danger threatened, but the gravity of the peril, except for a passing moment in the middle of the third century, did not fully appear until the beginning of the fifth century. Much less grave in reality, the dangers which menaced the frontier formed by the Euphrates yet seemed to Roman politicians of more importance. During all this period Persia was thought to be the only power that Rome need fear. In both quarters the Romans were on the whole able to defend themselves victoriously during the first four centuries. The " Roman Peace " was no vain word. Those who held the reins of government managed to succeed, with but few exceptions, in protecting the Empire against insulting attacks from its neighbours. They were also able to insure an internal peace such as Western Europe had not known up to that time, and which it was not to know again in the centuries that followed.

Power was then often placed in capable hands. Though the first successors of Augustus have left an ugly name, and though the fame of the Flavians who succeeded them was darkened by the tyranny of Domitian (the last of that race), yet the end of the first century saw the Antonines established on the throne of the Cæsars. This dynasty safeguarded the Empire for a whole century against both internal and external foes, and fostered the development of civilisation. Even the third century, in spite of growing anarchy, was marked by the rule of some energetic princes, who were valiant soldiers and good administrators, who worked bravely for the Roman cause. After a crisis, which reached its height about A.D. 270, the Empire was able to right itself, thanks to the intervention of Diocletian, whose statecraft postponed for more than a century the catastrophe which for a moment had appeared imminent. The system of administration which he inaugurated, and which was partially retained under Constantine, spelt a respite of two centuries for Roman civilisation in the West; whilst in the East, this civilisation passed little by little into that Byzantine civilisation, which was to carry on, far into the Middle Ages, all that was best in the traditions of Rome.

It was in this great Empire, such as we have described it, that the new religion had to find its place. At an early hour the thinkers among the Christians recognised with satisfaction the facilities offered to propaganda by a political situation unparalleled in history. The "Pax Romana" insured free and relatively rapid traffic throughout the Empire; the language was growing uniform in the many provinces which formed the immense

state. The time was at hand when with Greek and Latin one could make one's way everywhere, if not in the country districts, yet in all, even the smaller towns. A Roman citizen—and from the third century all free-born men might lay claim to this title—could feel at home in every part of the Empire.

Judged, however, from the religious point of view, the different provinces presented a motley variety of aspect. Efforts had been made to fuse in one Pantheon the ancient gods of the city and the deities of the conquered peoples; but beneath the Greek and Latin sounding names with which these deities had been rechristened, it was not hard to recognise the deities indigenous to Africa, Spain, Gaul, Asia, Egypt, and the lands watered by the Danube. Another cult was also tending to establish itself in Rome: the cult of the Emperors, who embodied the glory and power of Rome, and were therefore deified. But it was not only by inconceivable flattery that the epithet divine was applied to the Cæsars, it was an epithet which even Christian sovereigns were to find a difficulty in disregarding—many who used it thinking, no doubt, of the divine power, of which the majesty of Rome was a symbol. The worship of the Roman gods, of Rome, of the Emperor, was a costly and magnificent worship, carried out, as it was, in all the cities and smaller towns of the Empire. It was a purely external worship which never pretended to constrain Roman subjects to lead a better or purer life. A richly endowed priesthood, recruited as a rule from the noblest families, attended to this cult. It was their duty to see that the religious rites took place in due season and according to traditional rules: pompous processions,

sacrifices, libations, and public games, for these formed an important item in the religious feasts. The priests acquitted themselves of these duties with the greatest indifference, not even caring to know the meaning of the rites that they practised each day.

There were, however, other cults which endeavoured to satisfy the religious needs of the inhabitants of the Empire. Without speaking of the old local superstitions, piously preserved in the country parts, there were certain Oriental religions—of mysterious origin, bizarre rites and complicated and inaccessible doctrine—which, during the last century before the Christian era, had begun to spread in many towns of the Empire, where they entered into rivalry with the official cult. But if they practised openly some of their rites, they had the common characteristic of being occult religions, based upon mysteries which were known only to the initiated. It was only after a longer or shorter probation of gradual initiation and successive purifications that the candidate was introduced to the knowledge of the fundamental mystery, and its bearing upon the conduct of life. All these religions offered to those who were prepared to receive it a secret teaching as to the means of attaining salvation, that is to say, a happy immortality. This doctrine of salvation demanded an inner adhesion of the soul, the reception of certain initial rites, and obliged the believer to the practice of certain exterior acts which were supposed to carry on into daily life the good commenced by the initial ceremonies. By insisting on the necessity of certain beliefs, by the practice through the course of life of certain—sometimes complicated—rites, by the observance of

certain abstentions—of which some were certainly not without merit—these occult religions differed profoundly from the official polytheism. It would seem nevertheless that they did not exact from their adherents much more than an exterior submission to their prescribed rites, and their practice seems not to have been incompatible with every kind of dissoluteness and moral aberration. During the second century of the Christian era it was the religion of Mithra which represented most adequately within the Empire these importations. Of Persian origin, this religion had spread in Asia Minor and Syria, and from thence it was carried to all parts of the West, especially to the outlying frontiers where the legionaries were habitually stationed. It was also this religion of Mithra which was destined to survive by many years the fall of official paganism. More than once the doctors of the Christian Church busied themselves in tracing the outward resemblances which this religion and Christianity had in common, denouncing the religion of Mithra as a diabolical counterfeit of the religion of Jesus Christ. This idea of their resemblance was exaggerated, even radically false, although it is possible that these two rival religions reacted upon each other in point of minor detail. It remains nevertheless true that the propagation of these different Oriental religions in the Roman Empire helps us to understand to a certain extent the development of Christianity. Seen from this point of view, the extension of Christianity does not appear as an isolated phenomenon without precedent. The religion of Christ, in its beginnings, must have appeared, to the superficial observer, hardly different from those many religious

novelties which had for some time been diffused throughout the Empire. Imperial policy, however, soon took upon itself to discriminate in this matter.

If the different Oriental sects held out vague and mysterious hopes to the many who were troubled by religious yearnings, philosophy on its side offered to certain élite minds a means of regulating the conduct of life. Purely metaphysical speculation—that flower of Greek thought—had among the Romans given way to an investigation of moral issues more in harmony with their practical spirit. It is true that in the third century the school of Alexandria, taking up on new lines the inquiries of Plato, was to lend a renewed activity to discussions of an ontological order. But even this school rapidly turned the current of Neo-Platonic thought towards questions bearing on religious issues; that is to say, it entered the domain of pragmatism, a domain occupied by all the other philosophies which held the mind of the public since the days of Cicero. Stoicism, separated from all the cosmological apparatus which characterised its origins, became on Roman soil a system of almost purely moral speculation. Such men as Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius conjure up the vision of a noble effort made by independent thought in search of truth and virtue, an admirable striving after personal perfection, and proud aspirations towards interior liberty. But this very nobility is accompanied by a secret pride, hostile to the vulgar herd, and frequently indifferent to action. Both Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius knew the teaching of Christ, which on many points fell in with their ideals; yet the first despised Christianity, and the

second openly persecuted it. If the Stoics showed themselves thus rebellious towards the influence of the new religion, what are we to say of those epicurean and cynical philosophies which were drawing far more attention at that time? In truth their representatives were in general but charlatans of a higher or lower order, brilliant but superficial lecturers, in quest of fortune, and without higher ideals or greatness of soul.

The summary sketch which we have just given makes it easier for us to appreciate the advantages and disadvantages which the propagation of Christianity had to encounter under the conditions of Roman civilisation prevalent at that time. Safe and rapid communication between the different parts of the Empire, and linguistic facilities, were the principal material advantages. Certain moral facilities were offered by the fact that the decay of official paganism had robbed its cult of all religious sentiment, while the solutions offered to religious feeling by philosophy or by the occult religions of the East were obviously insufficient. But while recognising these advantages let us consider also the countless obstacles. The very centralisation of the Empire, the fact that all power was invested in one man, made it possible to let loose with one stroke a systematic persecution throughout the Empire. As for the lowering of moral standards which had followed upon the decadence of national religions, Christianity had more to lose than to gain by this. The rival claims of the occult religions of the East were also not to be despised, still less the hostility of those philosophies which had got a firm hold upon public opinion.

INTRODUCTION

It was an arduous undertaking which Christ confided to His apostles when He commanded them to go forth and preach the gospel to all nations. But He had added to the command the promise "Behold I am with you even to the consummation of the world."

PART I

THE CHURCH AND THE PAGAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER I

THE PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

The Church of Jerusalem—The Diffusion of Christianity in the East—In the West.

The Church of Jerusalem.—Jerusalem, the cradle of Christianity, did not long remain the radiating centre of the new religion. Twenty years after the Ascension the Holy City found itself already isolated, watching with a somewhat jealous eye the progress which the evangelisation of the pagans was making within the Roman Empire.

For not having understood that the religion preached by Christ was something more and better than a mere reform of Judaism: for having tried to exclude from a participation in the "Good Tidings" those pagans who would not consent to become Jews in order to become Christians: the first Christian community quickly assumed a special, and somewhat archaic, aspect, which soon made it hardly recognised by the more authentic exponents of Christian thought. In outward appearance it hardly distinguished itself from a Jewish sect, and at the same time did not win the favour of the official Jewish authorities. Caught between the suspicion

of those Christians who had been converted from paganism, and the hatred of the Synagogue, the primitive Jewish-Christian Church of Jerusalem soon saw its influence disappear. The events of A.D. 70 saw its final overthrow. The little community of Jerusalem escaped, it is true, the disaster which destroyed the Holy City. Taking refuge beyond the Jordan at the time of the catastrophe, it succeeded, when calm was restored, in regaining a footing among the ruins of Jerusalem. This little community formed the centre of a certain number of early primitive Jewish-Christian communities scattered throughout Palestine, and especially in Galilee. Taken all together, it was but a tiny fold, of which the precarious organisation did not survive the last Jewish insurrection of A.D. 132. On the ruins of Jerusalem the emperor Hadrian raised a Roman colony—Ælia Capitolina—to which no Jew could gain access. This was the end of the primitive Jewish-Christian Church of Jerusalem, and of the associations, memories, and traditions which it had treasured. At a later period, which it is difficult to accurately define, a Christian community established itself at Ælia, but, recruited among pagans, it had nothing, not even its name, in common with the church of St James. It was only at the end of the fourth century that the bishop of Ælia took again the title of bishop of Jerusalem. While the Christian community in Jerusalem was gradually losing ground and disappearing, the little groups of converted Jews, dispersed throughout Palestine, led an existence that quickly faded into obscurity. They were hardly regarded as genuine Christians by the representatives of the more developed Christian churches. It was with difficulty

that these Nazarenes, as they were called, could be recognised as the genuine descendants of the first disciples of Jesus Christ. A certain number of them, under the name of Ebionites, were finally denounced as heretics. This cessation of development in the midst of the budding life which characterised the new religion was certainly a melancholy sight. But while this branch which had grown directly out of the first preaching of the gospel atrophied, the chance branch constituted by the first communities of pagan origin flourished and grew. It was destined to become a great tree of which the branches were soon to extend throughout the whole Roman Empire.

Two great cities became the centres of this development which in a short time was to bring Christianity into the different countries of the Empire: Antioch, where the new religion took its name and to a certain extent some of its specific characteristics, and Rome, where at an early date Peter and Paul were working, after having established at Antioch a general field of action. In celebrating two distinct feasts, that of the chair of St Peter at Antioch and that of the chair of St Peter at Rome, the modern liturgy honours the two cities which were for the East and the West the starting points of evangelisation.

The Diffusion of Christianity in the East.—The gospel made more rapid conquests and penetrated more deeply into the East than into the West. From the very beginning Antioch was the centre from which Syria was evangelised. It was from Antioch that Paul went out to the conquest of Asia Minor. Three great missionary journeys resulted

in the formation of a close network of churches. His two last journeys brought Paul to Macedonia and Greece, where Christian communities such as those of Corinth and Philippi were to serve as solid outposts for the propagation of the gospel. If we are but poorly informed as to the ultimate destiny of the churches in this region, we know on the other hand many details relating to the Christian communities in Asia during the second generation after Christ. The Apocalypse, which had its birth in those parts, gives the names of the seven Churches grouped in the western portion of Anatolia. Smyrna, Ephesus, where the memory of the apostle St John was long to linger, were for the coast of Asia Minor active centres of propaganda. Farther East the plains of Galatia preserved the memory of Paul's missionary activity, while on the North, Bithynia and Pontus—where we may assume that St Peter preached—appear to have been profoundly Christian at the beginning of the second century. In the interior, Cappadocia was opened up to the faith about the middle of the second century, and its capital, Cæsarea, takes its place in Christian history about the year 200. It is curious that Alexandria, the largest city of the Roman East, and the most active centre of Hellenic civilisation, was not affected at any very early date by the spread of Christianity. While pointing out the considerable rôle played by the other cities of the Levant during the progress of evangelisation, and while mentioning that recruits were made at an early hour in Cyrene, the New Testament is absolutely silent with regard to Egypt and its capital. The historian Eusebius mentions, without in any way confirming it, a tradition according to

which the evangelist Mark was the first to visit this country after the deaths of the apostles Peter and Paul. But the information given by this same historian about the early organisation of the church of Alexandria rests upon an error. It is nevertheless probable that this great Mediterranean seaport was visited at an early date by some preacher of the gospel. At the beginning of the second century the emperor Hadrian, when making a stay in Egypt, calls attention to the number of Christians to be found there, and an episcopal list, compiled during the first thirty years of the third century, gives names of which some go back to the end of the first century. It was, however, only at the end of the second century, when the fame of the Christian school of Alexandria began to spread, that the Egyptian church first emerged from obscurity.

Christianity, going out from all the Eastern countries of which we have been speaking, spread beyond the confines of the Roman Empire. In the South the advance was slowest. The Thebaid, it is true, was thoroughly Christianised at the beginning of the third century, but this was still Roman territory, and it was only in the course of the following century that Ethiopia (Abyssinia) was reached by Christian missionaries.

In the Semitic regions east of Antioch, the preaching of the gospel made, on the contrary, considerable progress at an early date. The town of Edessa (Ourfu), in Upper Mesopotamia, had in the middle of the second century become the capital of the small kingdom of Osrhoene, which preserved its independence well on into the following century. In 179 King Abgar IX and all his family were converted to Christianity. This dynasty remained

Christian until it finally disappeared, when Osrhoene was again united to the Empire. In this little kingdom, where there were many Jews, almost the whole population followed the example of its sovereign. This is the first instance in history of a whole country, king and people, accepting the religion of Christ. The church of Edessa, proud of its ancient origin, soon came to believe that its Christianity was of even an earlier date, that one of its kings had even known Jesus Christ, and had believed Him to be the Saviour, even before His Passion and Resurrection. Osrhoene, placed as a buffer state between the Roman and Persian Empires, contributed to the evangelisation of the latter. We know, however, very little about the progress of Christianity in these regions, where apparently numerous Jewish colonies had prepared the way for the preaching of the gospel.

If we were certain that St Thomas had really passed through these countries it might be possible to date back to him the first vestiges of Christian organisation. But nothing is less reliable than the information that has come down to us relative to the journeys of this apostle, and everything leads us to believe that before the advent of the Sassanide dynasty in A.D. 226 the Persian Empire did not possess any organised Christian communities. We ought to accept with even more caution the legends current about St Thomas's activity in India. Apart from the fact that the Christian writers, even those of Eastern origin, fail to give us any geographical details, the accounts given of the activities of this apostle are of such doubtful authenticity that it is impossible to use them as an historic basis. The "Christians of St Thomas," whom the first

European explorers discovered in India in the thirteenth and again in the sixteenth centuries, were the descendants of Nestorian churches, which were founded in the Persian Empire at the end of the fifth century.

Roman Anatolia contributed also to the propagation of Christianity in the Far East. Armenia, the most eastern province of Anatolia, was at that time divided into two parts, one of which was independent, while the other was subject to Rome. It was in the latter that, towards the middle of the third century, the religion of Christ became firmly established, thanks to the efforts and miracles of St Gregory Thaumaturgus, the first bishop of Neo-Cæsarea. At the beginning of the following century, Christianity crossed the frontier, and penetrated into the independent part of Armenia, and as far as the region of the Caucasus. To the north of the Greek provinces of Achaia, and Macedonia, in the countries along the lower Danube the gospel was preached about the middle of the third century. On the other side of the great river, even beyond the Roman colonies established by Trajan, as far as the vast plains of Scythia, Christianity had gained adherents among the Goths. In the middle of the third century this people began to come in contact with Roman subjects all along the lower course of the Danube. We should, of course, have to place the introduction of Christianity into southern Russia at a much earlier date if we were to credit certain legends about the apostle St Andrew, but here, as with the acts of St Thomas, it is impossible to distinguish between authentic and apocryphal traditions.

It is evident that the Church during the second

and beginning of the third centuries had succeeded in establishing a strong position in the East. A network of Christian communities, dense round the coasts of the Mediterranean, but loosening as the distance increased from this sea, covered the greater part of the East. There were hardly any countries of which the more important towns did not boast larger or smaller Christian communities. To tell the truth, we are less well informed as to the size of these Christian communities than as to their existence. But certain documents show that—particularly in Syria and Asia Minor—there were many places where the Christians made up an important part of the population, sometimes a tenth, sometimes a fourth, or third, and occasionally even the half of the whole population.

In the West.—The spread of Christianity in the West was for a long time less rapid than in the East. Nevertheless Rome became at a very early date a centre of Christian propaganda. From Rome, the capital of the Empire and Mistress of the Universe, the Christian faith was bound to spread rapidly to the larger cities of the West. But we are in no position to follow these developments. If on the one hand we are well informed about the origins of the churches of Syria and Asia Minor, it is on the other hand extremely difficult for us to pierce the obscurity which has gathered round the beginnings of the Western churches.

Rome itself forms no exception to this rule. It is true that a comparatively early tradition, known to Eusebius, makes the apostle Peter arrive in Rome somewhere about A.D. 40 and ascribes to his pontificate at Rome a duration of twenty-five years.

In admitting these dates, however, we find ourselves faced with so many difficulties that it seems wiser to abandon them. Still less is it possible to accept the countless legends which have gathered round the advent of St Peter in Rome and which have all one feature in common: the conflict of the prince of the apostles with Simon the Magician within the walls of the eternal city. The origins of this legend are obscure, and in all probability imagination plays a larger part in it than historic memories. It is interesting to note that, in its most ancient literary form, this legend makes Peter arrive in Rome after Paul had already left the eternal city.

On this last point it is quite possible that the legend is in accordance with historic truth. For it would seem, as far as anything definite can be said about these matters, that it was St Paul who first entered into closer contact with the Roman community. This Christian community, of whose origin absolutely nothing is known, was recognised by Paul in A.D. 56 as an important Christian body, animated by a faith which had become celebrated through the universe. St Paul proposed to pay this community a passing visit on his way to Spain. Providence furthered this project, but not in the way he had intended. It was as a prisoner that he entered Rome in A.D. 59. It is evident, however, that he cannot have been kept in strict confinement, for he was able, while in Rome, to work successfully in the field of evangelisation. When in 61 or 62 he was acquitted by the Imperial tribunal, and departed westward on his apostolic mission, he left behind him in Rome a strongly organised Christian community. It was about this

time without doubt that St Peter—whose traces the New Testament permits us to follow, first to Antioch, and then to the northern provinces of Asia—came to Rome. It was here that he wrote the first of his epistles, addressed from "Babylon" to the faithful of Bithynia, Pontus and Cappadocia. It was also at this moment that the situation of the Christians became disquieting in Rome and throughout the Empire. Calumnious rumours were circulated against them, which made it appear probable that rigorous measures would soon follow. The day was not far distant when—in 64—Nero was to let loose his rage against the infant Church of Rome. It is probable that St Peter was also one of the victims of the mass executions, ordered after the burning of Rome. With regard to Paul, who appears to have been at that time in Asia, he may have been captured there, and brought to Rome. In any case he was imprisoned here, in A.D. 67. Judging from his epistle to Timothy it appears that a regular process was instituted against him, and that there was no question of his falling a victim of the mass persecutions in which St Peter perhaps perished. Of the result of the process against him we know with certainty only that he perished by the sword, not far from Rome, towards the end of the reign of Nero.

If the martyrdom of the two apostles at Rome threw the weakened Roman community into confusion for a short time, this event was destined to lend to it, as soon as calm was restored, an extraordinary prestige. From the end of the first century the Church of Rome was honoured by all Christian communities as the Church of the apostles Peter and Paul, founded by them, and confirmed

by their glorious martyrdom. The Pope St Clement, one of the first successors of St Peter, associates in a common memory the two apostles, with all those who among the Romans had given, in their martyrdom, a magnificent example of courage. At about the same date St Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, celebrates in verse the merits of the Church of Rome, and alludes to its two illustrious leaders. In the second century the Christian writers from the different parts of the Empire testify, and independently of one another, that the Roman Church, because of its apostolic origins, was to be considered as the most venerable authority for both East and West: and this before the popes inferred this right by taking in the third century the title of successors of St Peter—a title, by the way, which at that time no one thought of disputing. No other Church but that of Rome claimed the honour of being the Church of Peter. This point was left unassailed by all the controversies regarding dogma and discipline which were to agitate different parties within the Church. Some might refuse to obey the bishop of Rome, but none denied him the right to hold the title of successor to St Peter. This unanimity and the antiquity of the tradition, are the most solid arguments for St Peter's coming to Rome and his martyrdom in the eternal city.

A time was to come when historians would take pleasure in representing Peter and his immediate successors as organising a systematic evangelisation of the Occident from the Roman centre. This somewhat theoretic point of view is not erroneous in as much as it is extremely probable that many of the preachers of the gospel who worked in our countries came from Rome or Italy. As regards

this latter country we must distinguish the northern part of the peninsula, the centre, and the southern part. The north did not quickly accept the preaching of the gospel, a peculiarity which has left traces in the religious geography of the Italy even of our day. In the great northern plains the bishoprics are few, and the dioceses very large, while the centre and south are covered with a close network of dioceses, some of which are tiny. Most of these small dioceses claim to have been founded at a very early date, and although we cannot accept their pretensions, we must acknowledge that many of these churches date from the third and even from the second century. Already from a very early date they appear to have been dependent on the Roman Church which from the beginning had consecrated their bishops. This dependence is easily explained by the fact that to these Italian communities Rome was the Mother Church which had taught them the rudiments of their faith and given them their first pastors.

On the other hand, although the churches of Africa were united by close bonds to the Church of Rome, it is not to be concluded that they derived their origin directly from this latter. It was Carthage which was, for Roman Africa, the centre from which Christianity radiated. Strange to say, no souvenir, even legendary, has been preserved of the origins of Christianity in this great city. It is not impossible that missionaries from the banks of the Tiber contributed to its conversion: but the fact that Latin was the language of the Church of Carthage, while in Rome the Christian Church continued to use Greek until the beginning of the third century, shows at least that the first gospel

workers did not bring to Carthage all the customs of Rome. Carthage became for Africa a sort of metropolis from which Christianity spread, more rapidly in the proconsulate Numidia, but more slowly in Mauritania. The most ancient relic which we possess of these African churches is the register dealing with the martyrdom of twelve Christians taken prisoners at Scillium in Numidia and executed at Carthage on the 17th of July, A.D. 180. These acts, which form the oldest dated document of Christian literature in the Latin tongue, show that at that period Christianity was no novelty on African soil. Nevertheless the history of Christian Carthage continues to be wrapped in obscurity until the last years of the second century when the activity of Tertullian casts a gleam of light upon it. Towards A.D. 250 it emerges brightly illumined by the fame of St Cyprian.

As for Spain, the gospel appears to have reached this country at a very early date. When St Paul wrote to the Romans in A.D. 56 he had the intention of visiting Spain, and some very ancient allusions to this journey make it permissible to believe that he accomplished his design. But we have no information whatever concerning this journey and its possible effects. If St Paul founded churches here, the memory of these churches seems to have been quickly lost, for, until the middle of the third century, nothing more is known about Christian Spain. If information is lacking, legend flourishes only too abundantly. The most famous of these inventions is that of the mission to Spain of St James the Greater, who is supposed to have visited this country before his martyrdom, which

took place at Jerusalem in A.D. 42. This legend as a matter of fact only came into being at a comparatively late date. It is not fully established until the ninth century. Authorised documents even openly contradict it. The same may be said about that other legend, according to which the body of St James was transported to Santiago di Compostella. And the account of seven bishops being sent to Spain by St Peter must be accepted with the same caution. The only facts to be gleaned from these legends are indications as to which parts of Spain first possessed organised Christian Churches. They seem to have been Terraconensis and Baetica (Andalusia). We have no clear knowledge of the Church in Spain until the middle of the third century, when on the one hand the letters of St Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, make known a certain number of episcopal sees in the north of the Peninsula, whilst on the other acts of the martyrs of incontestable authenticity reveal Christianity as already widespread and forming an organic whole. At the beginning of the fourth century the Council of Elvira (Granada) furnishes us with numerous details concerning the interior life of the Church in Spain.

In Gaul matters took much the same course. It is more than probable that the Mediterranean coast of Gaul was touched by Christian propaganda at a very early date. None the less we must reject as mere legends the accounts current about the landing of Magdalen and Lazarus on the coast of Provence. Taking into consideration the trade communications existing between the Greek port of Marseilles and the larger towns of the Levant, it was to be expected that sooner or later

one of those preachers of the gospel, described in the Acts of the Apostles, should find his way to this part of the world. That these preachers succeeded in winning disciples in Marseilles or in the neighbouring Roman towns such as Arles, Orange, Vienne or Lyons is not surprising, and certain funeral inscriptions have been found which prove that there were already Christians in these parts in the middle of the second century. But it is quite impossible to say if the churches were regularly organised in these parts or not. The veil is not lifted till about A.D. 170. The letter sent by the churches of Lyons and Vienne "to those of Asia and Phrygia" and recounting the martyrdom in 177 of the bishop Pothin and a certain number of Christians of all ages and sexes, is the first authentic document and also the first claim to glory of the church of Gaul. This document reveals to us a Christian community installed upon the banks of the Saône and Rhône, Greek in its origin and language, but which had succeeded in making disciples outside the large Greek colony of Marseilles. The immediate successor of St Pothin after the persecution, Bishop Irenæus, who also was of Greek origin (he was born in Smyrna), lent a lustre to the Church of Lyons during the last years of the second century; but it does not appear from his writings that there were any other organised churches in Gaul at that time. It is only half a century later, towards A.D. 250, that the existence of such communities at Arles, Toulouse, Rheims, and Trèves, can be affirmed; and it is only at the beginning of the fourth century that we can safely speak of the Christian Churches of Rouen, Paris, Bourges, Sens, Cologne, while yet another

quarter of a century must elapse before we can guarantee the existence of episcopal sees in the other important towns of Gaul. The Western provinces were also slower to be converted to Christianity, which here, as everywhere, followed the natural lines of communication.

In the Roman provinces along the Danube the course of events was not dissimilar. Although the Dalmatian coast received the gospel at an early hour (Salona appears to have had a Christian Church as early as the beginning of the second century), Moesia (Serbia) and Dobroudja (Bulgaria) can hardly have known anything of Christianity before the third century. If one follows the course of the Danube towards its source through Pannonia (Hungary), Noricum (Austria), and Rhætia (Bavaria and Würtemburg), one sees that here also it was only towards the middle of the third century that compact, regularly organised groups of Christian communities came into being.

To resume, let us say that in the last years of the first century the evangelisation of the West was as yet no more than prepared by the establishment in some of the larger cities of small groups of Christians, and this chiefly in the maritime ports. In the course of the following century the preaching of the gospel gained ground in the "Hinterland," although the Church did not yet flourish in these parts in at all the same way as in Asia, Syria, or Egypt at the same epoch. It was only towards the year 250, when the great persecution under Decius broke out, followed by that under Valerian, that the result of the hidden work effected during the first fifty years of the third century became apparent.

We must no doubt attribute something of the obscurity—which envelops the churches of the West—to the scarcity of information available and the meagre store of documents, relative to this time, that we have been able to collect. But the Christian writers of the fifth century, such as Sulpicius Severus, already called attention to the fact that Christianity had spread much more slowly in the two Gauls than in certain other provinces of the Empire; and Eusebius had previously made an analogous statement. The makers of legend, who in the following ages tried to date back the advent of Christianity in the West, bear witness by their very efforts, to the inexactitude of existing information.

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE: THE PERSECUTIONS

General Causes of Persecution—Spontaneous Persecution—The Edict of Trajan—The Persecutions of the Third Century.

THE most formidable obstacle opposed to the propagation of Christianity within the Empire was the obstinate resistance which for various reasons the Roman government saw fit to offer to the new religion. For two and a half centuries—although there were periods of relative calm—the position of Christians as individuals and of the Christian Church as a corporate body remained precarious in the extreme. There can be no exaggeration in designing the first three centuries of Christian history as an era of persecution.

General Causes of Persecution.—One may well ask what motives urged rulers, who were certainly not all the tyrants and monsters represented by popular hagiography, to engage in a struggle, ending often enough in a veritable war of extermination, against a religion which in no way threatened the safety of the State. That a Nero, a Domitian or a

Maximian should have acted thus is credible enough. They but included the Christians in a tyranny that weighed upon all their subjects. But that a Marcus Aurelius, or a Severus, a Decius, or Diocletian—just rulers, penetrated with a sense of duty, and devoted to the Roman cause—should have organised cruel persecutions, seems at first sight truly incredible. The Acts of the Martyrs, those at least which were compiled after the Church had entered upon a period of peace, solved the difficulty by painting the sovereigns and their officials in the blackest colours, and imputing their cruelty to strange and often unmentionable motives. This is not the truth of the matter. It can be said almost without exaggeration that the more an emperor was conscious of what he owed to the State—the more "Roman" he happened to be—the more implacable he showed himself in the repression of Christianity. The periods of calm for the Christians usually coincided with the reign of sovereigns who were either sceptics like Hadrian or Commodus, or else of foreign extraction, like the members of the Syrian dynasty. A true Roman could not well do otherwise than persecute the new religion, which throughout the Empire was threatening to supplant the old forms of worship.

This may appear strange when we recollect the tolerance meted out by the Romans to those Oriental religions which, as we have already pointed out, might at first sight be confounded with Christianity. We cease to wonder, however, when we reflect on the one hand upon the absolute exclusiveness of the Christian religion, and on the other upon the facility with which a devotee of Isis, Serapis, or Mithras could render homage to

the divinities of Rome. There was nothing to prevent one of these latter from burning incense before a statue of the emperor, while the Christians would see a crime merely in swearing by the "genius of the emperor." And whoever refused homage to the gods of the city, or of the State, and in particular to that far more concrete divinity called "the genius of the emperor" or "the goddess of Rome," was at once regarded as guilty of treason; for a citizen, as such, owed allegiance to the gods of his country. It is true that after the subjugation of the Jewish race the Romans were accustomed to see a people who abstained from taking any part in the national cult. The numerous Jewish communities scattered throughout the Empire professed a monotheism as rigorous as that of the followers of Jesus; but in general, and with the exception of troubles raised by the populace, the Jews were not persecuted for their refusal to worship Jupiter Capitolinus, or Venus Genetrix. This case of the Jews was the result of a situation created in the East by various concessions made to them and which had gradually come to be accepted in the West. If there was need to justify it by a legal fiction, there was always the resource of considering the Jews as a national minority, acquitting itself of its religious duties to its own god. The Jews were not considered "atheists," and as long as the Christians could shelter themselves under cover of the Jewish communities they benefited by this tolerance, but from the day when the distinction was made between the Jews and the adherents of the new religion, it was inevitable that the Christians should be persecuted: and the more so because public opinion

sustained the Roman State in the matter of violent suppression.

The mysterious bearing of the Christians, the care they took to hide their meetings from all eyes, the reports that circulated about the rites practised at their assemblies—all these things soon contributed to persuade the public that the new religion was abominable, its cult odious, grotesque or cruel; and that excesses of all kinds were committed in their safely guarded meetings. The most improbable accusations were believed even by the educated, and later, when these calumnies had been refuted, there remained always accusations of exclusiveness, of hatred against the human race (*odium generis humani*), and of plotting against the grandeur of Rome. These accusations can be partly explained by the retired lives led by many of the faithful, their contempt for certain official appointments, their unwillingness to take part in the manifestations of the city's public life; in fine the extreme utterances and exaggerations of some of their spokesmen.

For a considerable time Christianity found itself in this way outside the law, benefiting by a quite precarious tolerance which was often interrupted by violent paroxysms. Even if we do not accept as absolute the classification, first introduced by St Augustine, and ever since accepted, of ten distinct periods of persecution, yet we cannot but agree that the persecution of the Christians passed through different phases, which it is necessary to distinguish. These phases were determined by the different sets of codes which were at different times applied to the crime of religion. Quite spontaneous in the third part of the first century, the attacks upon the Christians were, at the beginning of the second

century, restrained and regulated by an Imperial rescript, which continued to be applied until the end of the Antonine dynasty. The fourth century saw the birth of a new régime, that of persecution by special edict. This period was for this very reason characterised by times of complete tranquillity alternating with periods of extreme violence.

Spontaneous Persecution.—Under this title of spontaneous persecution we wish to designate the measures of violence which were used against the Christians by individual Roman officials, generally at the instigation of the populace under pressure of artificially fanned excitement. This word spontaneous indicates clearly enough, that in our opinion there was not, as has been supposed on the vague evidence of Sulpicius Severus, a positive edict issued in the very beginning by the Imperial government forbidding the practice of Christianity throughout the whole Empire. Such an edict would have been superfluous. Once the Roman authorities knew of the existence of groups of Christians, distinct from the authorised Jewish communities, they were but acting in accordance with the legislative customs of Rome in prosecuting such groups. It is possible to dispute the nature of the powers in virtue of which certain Roman officials took the initiative in the persecution of the Christians, but that they were empowered to take measures of suppression, without any special Imperial decree, appears evident. In the year 57 Tacitus signalises the case of a woman, Pomponia Graecina, who belonged to one of the noblest families in Rome and who, because of her retired life and other indications, was accused of foreign superstition (*superstitionis externæ rea*). In

the regular course of events her case should have been tried by the ordinary courts, but, appealing to an ancient law, her husband, Aulus Plautius, claimed for himself the right to summon her before the family tribunal, and then himself declared her innocent. We cannot say with absolute certainty whether the superstition of which Pomponia was accused was Christianity or not. But this fact, which is so clearly attested, goes to prove that it was possible for a denunciation to lead to criminal proceedings against persons suspected on purely religious grounds. In many towns a mere request on the part of the accusers that the magistrates should apply the laws relating to religious matters sufficed to bring about trials which often ended in capital punishment for the victims. It is probable that the Jews played a considerable rôle in these prosecutions by denouncing the Christians as not belonging to their legally authorised Jewish communities.

We must, of course, distinguish from these more regular proceedings the mass massacres ordained by Nero in A.D. 64 after the burning of Rome. Here we find ourselves face to face with a wild act of folly perpetrated by a bloodthirsty tyrant who, to divert public opinion, threw upon a class of men who were detested by the populace, the odium of an act of which he himself was beginning to be accused. Arrested by the Imperial police in the poor quarters of the town, these Christians do not seem to have appeared before the tribunals at all. They were for the most part recruited among the slaves, the freedmen, the aliens and such as could lay no claim to the privileges reserved to Roman citizens. They were massacred without trial and with all the refinements of cruelty described by Tacitus. From the

account of this historian we can at least gather that a "great multitude" of Christians had been discovered, that already the worst accusations were made against them by the populace, and that these accusations had found credence among the intellectuals. Strange to say, primitive Christian tradition preserved no exact account of these terrible executions. The only allusion made to them is to be found in the writings of Pope Clement, towards the end of the first century. A little later, when the apocryphal Acts of SS. Peter and Paul were compiled, the martyrdom of these two apostles was placed in a quite different setting. No other Church besides that of Rome preserved a record of massacres in any way resembling those which decimated the primitive Christian community of Rome.

Such scenes were calculated to draw upon the Christians the attention of the masses, also indirectly that of the magistrates. It is possible that already under the Flavians, under Domitian in particular, legal proceedings were opened against Christians. The fact that several persons of high rank—for example the ex-consul, Flavius Clemens—were during this reign condemned for atheism and Jewish superstition, is reported by the profane historians of the period. And on the other hand, the rigour with which, under this same Domitian, the didrachm tax was collected from every Jew, helped to make known to the denouncers, and to the police, a large number of persons who, without being of Jewish race, sought protection unduly under cover of the privileges accorded to the Israelites. So much is certain: frequently enough in the Eastern provinces, but much seldomer in the West, Christians were tried and sentenced to death. This fact is established

by a letter of Pliny the Younger, of which more later on.

The Edict of Trajan.—The end of the first century saw the Antonines established upon the Imperial throne. After the horrors and humiliations which had marked the reign of Domitian Rome breathed freely again under a line of emperors who, with the exception of the last, Commodus, were all animated by a rare spirit of justice, and contributed largely to the greatness of Rome. Were the Christians then to enjoy at last that peace and tranquillity of which they had been deprived for so long? Far from it. What we have said above regarding the religious function of the State as conceived by the Romans makes it easier for us to understand why it could not be so. A certain abatement of persecution resulted none the less from the general reaction against the system of denunciation which had disgraced the reign of Domitian. The Christians, together with all other Roman subjects, profited by the universal spirit of justice and goodwill which replaced the shameful practices of the preceding era. Their position was at least clearly defined by the famous rescript of Trajan (A.D. 98-117), which specified precisely the laws to be followed in dealing with Christians and so fixed their fate for over a century.

Pliny the Younger, the personal friend of Trajan, was named by the latter Governor of Bithynia. Hardly had he arrived in the province when he found himself called upon to deal with numerous accusations against Christians. The trials which he inaugurated led to new denunciations. Soon the governor became aware of the fact that the accused

had committed no other crime than that of practising a proscribed religion. He found it distressing to send to death merely for this reason persons of otherwise exemplary lives. In several cases he offered the accused full pardon if, renouncing Christ, they would sacrifice to the Genius of the Emperor. More often than not this offer was a mere waste of time, and the governor then felt himself obliged to punish the obstinacy of the offenders. But on the other hand he asked himself what he was to do with the apostates. Was the religious crime which they had committed effaced by the mere renouncing of their former errors? In his perplexity the governor addressed himself to the Emperor.

Trajan's reply was extremely clear. In its *imperatoria brevitas* it fixed the line of conduct to be followed by the governor of Bithynia and served at the same time as a general guide for future cases of the same nature. "It is not necessary," writes the Emperor, "to search for these Christians; but if they are legally accused and found guilty, they must be punished. If they renounce their errors they are to be dismissed unharmed." Such are the broad lines given. The Emperor concludes with a hint to be very careful that the denunciations are strictly legal. He forbids the acceptance of anonymous denunciations. This rescript, when all is said, introduces only one novelty: the pardon to be accorded to apostates. In other words it recognises the fact that the profession of Christianity constitutes an offence of a special nature. Looking at it more closely we find in it the proof that the Christians were innocent of the crimes imputed to them by public opinion. The Emperor's remarks concerning the need for regular denunciations and legal proceed-

ings can best be explained by referring to the general principles of Roman law, which as a rule did not expect the magistrates to take the initiative in repressing crime (Roman law did not know the office of prosecuting magistrate), but left in the hands of private individuals who, rightly or wrongly, believed themselves injured, the care of bringing before the competent authorities even such acts as were qualified as crimes.

It is quite possible that this legal provision was more than once ignored in the proceedings taken against the Christians before the rescript of Trajan was issued. The fact of recalling it constituted a certain guarantee for the Christians, precarious perhaps, but still a guarantee of some importance. The fact that their enemies were obliged personally to lodge a legal accusation against them, and so expose themselves to grave risks if their accusation was proved false, contributed certainly to limit the number of proceedings taken against Christians. On the other hand it is to be remembered that the rescript of Trajan was based on the principle that a Christian as such, if legally accused and convicted, was liable to capital punishment.

A small number of Acts of the Martyrs, compiled at intervals during the second century, and of which the authenticity is beyond suspicion, show that this legislation did not remain a dead letter. The complaints made with untiring monotony by the Christian apologists during this same period also bear testimony to the fact. During the reign of Trajan (98-117), as also during the reigns of Antoninus Pius (138-161) and of Marcus Aurelius (161-189), many martyrdoms are signalised and one is at a loss to see why historians should have dis-

tinguished a persecution under Trajan and another under Marcus Aurelius, separated the one from the other by an interval of peace during the reigns of Hadrian (117-138) and of Antoninus Pius. All that we can say is that these two latter emperors tried to resist the immoderate influence of public opinion, and to hold the laws well within the limits traced by Trajan. A rescript addressed by Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus, proconsul in Asia in A.D. 125, and which is apparently authentic, forbids the magistrates to proceed *ex officio* against the Christians, or to accept the accusations of the mob. But this rescript was not always respected. The bishop of Smyrna, St Polycarp, was martyred in A.D. 155 because the populace, excited by the spectacle of the legal execution of a number of Christians, rose up in the stadium and demanded the death of the bishop. This same fury of the mob was also in 177 the cause of the martyrdom of the Christians of Lyons. Overcome by this popular fanaticism Marcus Aurelius, to whom the governor had appealed, did not venture to enforce the measures prescribed by the rescript of Trajan.

It was under the last of the Antonines, Commodus (180-192), who in other ways was a monster, that the situation of the Christians was the least deplorable. It is possible that already before the beginning of his reign the penalty of death had been transmuted to that of penal servitude, which, by the way, was also regarded as capital punishment. Be that as it may, a contemporary account tells us of a certain reprieve accorded by Commodus to Christians who had been condemned to hard labour in the Sardinian mines. According to this account the bishop of Rome was invited to furnish

a list of the members of his flock who were thus condemned and a Roman priest was sent to deliver these unfortunate convicts.

We may say in general that during the second century the Church never enjoyed real peace. The law of Rome which identified with the crime of high treason any reluctance to worship the official deities, hung always as a sword over the heads of the Christians. A legal denunciation was sufficient to draw down this threatening danger, and the true Christian, who would not apostatise or even make a pretence of apostatising, had to face continually the prospect of martyrdom. It is true that we have few authentic documents relating to the execution of Christians during this period, but we must not conclude that cases of martyrdom were rare. The opposite rather must be inferred from the writings of Christian apologists, who never ceased to appeal to the good sense and equity of the emperors, hoping thus to obtain some amelioration in the intolerable situation of the Christians.

The Persecutions of the Third Century.—Trajan's rescript was never revoked. Nevertheless from the third century on, certain emperors fixed their attention more exclusively upon the danger which threatened the Roman cause through the existence of the new religion which, especially in the West, began, about this time, to develop in a manner until then unknown. These emperors, then, were inclined to abandon the clause inserted by Trajan: "There shall be no *search* for Christians." On the contrary, they even prescribed the pursuit of certain classes of Christians and even of all followers

of Christ. Persecution of the Christians was no longer left to chance denunciation or even to the more or less keen vigilance of the magistrates. A plan of repression was traced, and its application directed straight from the Imperial state office. This accounts for the character of the persecutions of the third century, which were generally of short duration but extremely violent, and separated from each other by fairly long truces—when an emperor annulled his own edict, or when his successor abolished it.

It is to the emperor Septimius Severus (A.D. 193-211), elected by the legions of the Danube after the murder of Commodus and Pertinax, that we should apparently attribute the first edict directed expressly against the Christians. He is supposed to have passed a law in A.D. 201 absolutely forbidding anyone to become a Jew or a Christian. From the somewhat cursory clause used by Spartianus to record this prohibition it has been concluded that the edict had only fresh conversions in view, and that Christians of older standing did not suffer under the new law. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the fact that several of the Acts of the Martyrs of this time relate to neophytes and catechumens. On the other hand, the writings of Tertullian and certain remarks of Eusebius convey a totally different impression, and it is probable that, at any rate in certain provinces, the prosecutions were not confined to converts but included Christians of older standing. We must doubtless bear in mind the fact to which Tertullian expressly calls attention, namely that much depended upon the individual character of the magistrate, who was at liberty to interpret more or less severely the

Imperial orders. However that may be, this persecution which, according to Eusebius, made countless victims at Alexandria, and gravely disorganised the catechetical school, was not of long duration. Even in the time of Severus the prosecutions relaxed, and they ceased completely under his successors, Caracalla, Macrinus, and Heliogabulus. This latter, a Syrian by origin, was penetrated with the religious syncretism of the East, and being in every way but little of a Roman, did not think of persecuting the Christians. A day even came when Alexander Severus, whose mother, Mamaea, was a Christian, mounted the Imperial throne (222-235), and it was said that he thought of raising a temple to Jesus Christ. The Christians in any case benefited by a larger tolerance, and it seems that their communities received, *de facto* if not *de jure*, a recognition which enabled them to acquire property and to appear in court.

With the advent of Maximin the Thracian (135-238) things changed again. Raised to the Imperial throne by the military revolution which had ended in the assassination of Alexander Severus, Maximin set himself to oppose all that could recall his predecessor. The attitude of the new emperor made itself everywhere felt, but particularly in matters religious. A new edict was issued against the Christians. Eusebius expressly says that it aimed at the heads of the churches, who were at that time well known to the Imperial administration. In Rome itself, Pope Pontianus, and the presbyter Hippolytus, who had seceded under Pope Callistus, and who was head of a small schismatic community, were simultaneously arrested. Both were exiled to Sardinia and doubtless were condemned to the

same hard labour in the mines from which Commodus had released the other Christian prisoners. In their common misfortune these two confessors became reconciled; but both died shortly afterwards. We do not know if other Christian bishops had to endure a like persecution. Eusebius has preserved the memory of a certain Protoclete, presbyter of the Church of Cæsarea, who succumbed during this persecution, which shows that under the title "heads of the churches," simple priests were also included.

Happily the reign of Maximin was a short one. Assassinated before the walls of Aquileia in 238 he had as successor, after the ephemeral reigns of Gordian I, Pupienus, and Balbinus, Gordian III, during whose reign the Christians enjoyed peace. It appears also that it was while Gordian III was emperor that Pope Fabian (236-250) obtained from the Roman government an authorisation to bring back from Sardinia the remains of his predecessor Pontianus. The translation was made to the cemetery of St Callistus with great solemnity, while at the same time the relics of St Hippolyte were buried in the cemetery in the Via Tiburtina. About this time the Christians began to emerge more and more into broad daylight, and the time seemed to be approaching when Christianity would be officially recognised. In 244 Philip the Arab having paved the way to the throne by the murder of Gordian III, became himself emperor. In spite of all the reproaches made against Philip's public and private life it appears that he was a Christian. If he did not legally favour the new religion by any formal act, it is nevertheless easy to understand that in his reign Christianity enjoyed a publicity that until

that time it had never known. We may conjecture that Philip intended to take a further step in the matter, but it was to one less unworthy that Christianity would one day owe its official recognition. Raised to the throne by crime and revolt, Philip was to be cast from it in the same manner. In A.D. 248 Decius was proclaimed emperor by the insurgent legions. In A.D. 249 he gained over his rival the victory of Verona in which Philip was killed. Master of Italy and, with time, of the Empire, Decius, a Roman of the old school, did not hide his designs for the reform of public morals, and the establishment by every means in his power of the old religion. The defeat of Philip at Verona also spelt defeat for the Christian cause.

Hardly was he established on the Imperial throne when Decius issued a rigorous edict against the Christians. It obliged everyone who was suspected of being a Christian to make an official act of apostasy and to furnish a legalised certificate of such an act. Those who refused were to be condemned to imprisonment and torture, the goods of fugitives were to be seized, and those who refused to conform were to be put to death. Rigorously applied throughout the Empire, these measures seemed to have an immense success. If the number of confessors and martyrs was large, that alas! of apostates was still more so. Contemporary documents, such as the letters of the bishops of Carthage, and of Alexandria, of St Cyprian and St Denis, give us a picture of the masses of the faithful which is but little edifying. We shall have to speak later of the trouble caused in the Church by the pretensions of these renegades. Fortunately this persecution did not last long. At

the end of the year 250 the more rigorous measures were relaxed; and the bishops, who for the most part had escaped by flight, were able to return to their decimated flocks. In A.D. 251 Decius died fighting against the enemy on the Danube. His successor Gallus took up again, it is true, certain measures of persecution. Several bishops, among them the bishop of Rome, Pope Cornelius, were sent into exile, but finally the edicts were withdrawn, and peace was restored to the Christian communities.

This peace, however, was of short duration. In 257 the emperor Valerian (253-260) recommenced the campaign against the Church. Understanding how impossible it would be to compel the masses of Christians to revert to paganism, he made it rather his aim to disorganise the Churches by attacking their heads, thinking that if the leaders were once got rid of, or subdued, it would be easier to disperse the Christian flocks. The natural equity of the Emperor, however, recoiled for some time from the idea of a bloodthirsty persecution. The edict of 257 directed against the clergy gave them the choice of sacrificing to the gods, or going into voluntary exile. At the same time the places of worship and the cemeteries were sequestered, and all reunions forbidden. These measures proving ineffectual, a sanguinary persecution was inaugurated by edict in 258. The penalty of death was proclaimed against all rebellious clerics, and various penalties were directed against such members of the Christian communities as were of noble birth. Once more the blood of the martyrs began to flow, and the prisons to be filled with victims. In Rome Pope Sixtus and his deacon

Lawrence, and in Carthage the noble bishop Cyprian, gave their lives with admirable generosity and simplicity. In 260 Valerian in a campaign against the Persians was made prisoner by Sapor, the "King of Kings," who refused to release him. His son Gallienus, who had been associated with his father in the government, succeeded him on the throne. Did he perhaps understand the lesson which Providence had given his father? In any case a general edict was issued not long after, by which the heads of the different Christian communities were allowed to resume their functions with full liberty, while rescripts followed regulating the restitution of the cemeteries and places of worship.

This calm was to last a considerable time. The historians of the last and greatest persecution, that organised by Diocletian at the beginning of the fourth century, speak of a period of uninterrupted tranquillity, which preceded it and lasted no less than forty years. This does not imply that there were not here and there local incidents and isolated cases of martyrdom. We cannot ignore, on a plea of exception, the local traditions which ascribe martyrdoms to this period. But it is certain that, compared with the two terrible crises which had marked the middle of the century, the last decades of the third century were, for the Church, relatively calm, and a period of active development. This is the time when the Church assumes within the Roman Empire her characteristic physiognomy and fixes the broad lines of her organisation. It is also the happy moment when she has no history. The sources which flowed so abundantly concerning the earlier part of the century grow scarcer and scarcer

as we draw near to the end. So few are the records that we are not in a position to verify the statement of Lactantius, who attributes to Aurelian intentions of persecution, which, however, were not carried into effect. Slowly but surely Christianity gained ground within the Empire, and everything, down to the religious syncretism of the epoch, seems to have helped to prepare its final triumph. This triumph, however, was to be achieved only after another terrible crisis, the hardest and longest of all those through which the Church was obliged to pass. The persecution of Diocletian, the " great persecution," introduced a new era of martyrs. It was the last effort made by official paganism against the Christian Church now about to emerge triumphant from the long struggle.

CHAPTER III

THE INTERIOR LIFE OF THE CHURCH

The Ecclesiastical Constitution—The Church of Rome—Mission of the Church—The Teaching of the Church—The Sacraments.

In spite of all the difficulties and obstacles which we have described as having been put in its way—perhaps because of these very obstacles—the Church did not cease during these two and a half centuries to perfect its interior organisation and to adapt to the needs of its ever growing and diverse members the means of salvation which it had received from its Divine Master.

The Hierarchy.—A number of documents which have come down to us straight from the time permit us to follow with a certain exactitude the life of the great Christian communities in the middle of the third century. We can see how the churches in Rome and Carthage and Alexandria were locally organised and in what relation they stood to the neighbouring churches, and how in the union of the different churches a common accord, the unity of the Catholic Church, was exposed. If towards the year 250 Catholicism presents the same essential features that it presents to-day, a search through the

sparse documents of the earlier centuries shows at once that this ecclesiastical constitution, such as we see it in the third century, was not even then anything new, nor any spontaneous creation, but that its outlines, clearly distinguishable, can be traced back to apostolic times.

The most salient feature is certainly the distinction between two large categories of faithful: the general body of believers on the one hand and their leaders on the other, between laity and clergy. From the beginning there is no trace of anarchy or confusion. The clergy are charged with the general administration of the community, the care of its interests, material as well as spiritual, and with the dispensing of the sacraments as the means of salvation. It was their business to instruct the Christian people in the necessary truths, to put them on their guard against doubtful doctrine, and to chastise the fomenters of heresy and schism. In comparison with the clergy the lay members held a distinctly subordinate position. But this is not to say that their rôle was purely passive. If they nowhere appear as the real holders of a power which they merely conferred, as it were by proxy, on the clergy whom they elected, yet the laity were none the less vitally concerned in all the affairs of the Church. It was they who by election appointed the clergy, although the power of exercising the sacred functions was not conferred by them. They were consulted as to measures to be taken. Their votes were asked in important circumstances. In short they were genuinely connected with the life of the Church.

This distribution of the different rôles within the Church dates back much further than the third century. Even in apostolic times the line of

demarcation, between the flock and the pastor who directed it, is evident. The Acts of the Apostles show us in the Church of Jerusalem a very marked distinction between the multitude of brethren and the body composed of the " twelve " to whom were soon joined the deacons and later the elders. In the course of his missionary journeys Paul, after passing some time in a city, never leaves without having established by his own authority overseers (*episcopoi*: bishops) or elders (*presbyteroi*: priests) entrusted with the charge of the infant community. We see Paul on his visit to Miletus, calling together the heads of the neighbouring churches in order to bring home to them their duties towards the flocks confided to their care. In the epistles called pastorals we see him depicting for Timothy or Titus the ideal type of leader to be chosen for the infant churches. Some thirty years later, we find the Roman Church by the pen of its head, Clement, reproaching energetically the Church of Corinth for having by a *coup d'état* rudely expelled its lawful administrators. " This shows great contempt," says the saintly pope, " for the divine order, by which the power descending from the Father to the Son has been transmitted by Him to His apostles and their successors." At about the same time the bishop of Antioch, Ignatius, passing through Asia, left as his legacy to the churches of this region an ardent recommendation to give joyous obedience to the heads of their communities, as to the representatives of God. Far then from having been instituted in the second century merely as a means for combating more effectually doctrinal aberrations of which more anon, the ecclesiastical hierarchy by divine right had been from the first one of the most

active agents in resisting error. When St Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, exposes in his treatise on "The Unity of the Church" the rights and prerogatives of the hierarchy he is merely carrying on an old-established tradition.

In the same way the composition of the hierarchical body which in his day governed the Church was already in the middle of the third century an ancient institution. The clergy governing the great churches of Rome, Carthage, Alexandria do not give the impression of forming a council composed of members equal in rights and authority and having at its head a removable president. On the contrary, each one of the churches was embodied, so to speak, in the person of one man, known in East and West alike by the name of bishop. At his side, but distinctly lower in grade, we find the priests, helpers and counsellors of the bishop, and entrusted by him with different missions, chiefly spiritual, while under the priests again were the deacons, employed chiefly in the material administration of the Church. Finally—for the better accomplishment of all the sacred functions—we find, at least in the more important churches, lectors, sub-deacons, acolytes and porters inscribed on the rolls. Certain persons having received from God a special gift for solacing the sick and in particular the obsessed, were also admitted to the ranks of the clergy. They were called by different names; "exorcists" is the one that has survived. There was also a custom according to which certain lay persons who had confessed their faith before the tribunals and who, having suffered for Christ, were entitled to a place of honour, were allowed seats in that portion of the sacred edifice which was reserved for the clergy.

Without having been ordained, these " confessors " took their place among the most honoured members of the hierarchy.

Such is the picture that we receive of the local clergy of the primitive Christian churches. It is more or less simplified in certain districts. But if we omit the last named categories we find that the main divisions of bishops, priests and deacons exist everywhere. They date back to the earliest Christian ages. The names at least occur already in the Acts of the Apostles, though it is difficult to say if the functions pertaining to each of these names were the same in the beginning as they became later. In particular we do not see clearly the distinction that was made in the beginning between bishops and priests, a distinction that we find firmly established almost everywhere from the middle of the second century on. It seems rather as if in the very beginning, in the communities created by St Paul, authority was exercised by a college of members. Considered from the point of view of their age, these members were called " ancients " (*presbyteroi*: priests); if attention was drawn rather to their responsibility they were termed " overseers " (*episcopoi*: bishops). When all was said and done, the real head of each community was the apostle who had founded it and who, if separated from it, did not cease even at a distance to occupy himself with the spiritual needs of his neophytes. That such an episcopal or presbyteral college could not function without a head stands to reason. That the choice of such a head was not left to chance by the apostle-founder may be conjectured from certain advice given in the pastoral epistles. In this manner a link can be established

between what critics call the "collective episcopacy" and the "monarchic episcopacy." The transition from one form of government to the other was effected more or less rapidly according to the conditions of each church. The paucity of documents to hand makes it impossible for us to follow the curve of this development. The little catechism known under the name of the "Didache," which may date back to the last decades of the first century, mentions only two orders in the local church of which it describes the administration: bishops and deacons. The letters of St Ignatius, on the other hand, speak clearly of *one* bishop together with priests and deacons in each Christian community. So much is certain: towards the middle of the second century the monarchical form of episcopacy is everywhere established. It is interesting to note how from this time on an effort is made in the different churches to draw up a list of the earliest bishops, who are represented as monarchical bishops. It follows that from the beginning, and that in virtue of an apostolic institution, the president of the different episcopal colleges enjoyed a certain pre-eminence, but this is not clearly indicated in the few texts dealing with the earliest period which have reached us.

In the middle of the third century each one of the local churches with its bishop, its priests, deacons and inferior ministers formed a little centre of Christian life which, in case of necessity, sufficed to itself. The number of these centres varied with the different regions. In proconsular Africa and in Numidia every little town seems to have had its bishop, and this was also the case in Central and Southern Italy, and in the south of Gaul, where the

first bishoprics were established about this time. The same state of things existed in the delta of the Nile, in Syria, and in proconsular Asia. In those countries on the contrary which were more slowly opened up to the gospel a different system seems to have been adopted. Only the large towns, which in general were the first centres of Christian activity, had completely organised churches, which stand out clearly from the lesser groups of priests, deacons, and even inferior ministers who in the remoter districts were charged with preaching, catechising, and exercising some of the sacred functions and who were free to send the recruits they had made to the episcopal town for more important functions. Although we cannot yet speak of circumscribed parishes yet we can note the development of something analogous in certain large dioceses during the second half of the third century.

Confined as they might be to the small limits of a municipality or of a military colony, or spreading out over the surface of an entire province, the different churches did not remain in proud isolation. True, it is not easy to determine exactly the hierarchical bonds which united one with the other, and with the exception of one solitary case, it is impossible to determine the subordination of communities of secondary importance to churches recognised as centres. But it is incontestable that in the middle of the third century rough outlines can be traced of what were afterwards called ecclesiastical provinces. St Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, might in a moment of irritation claim for each bishop the right to act as he thought fit, holding himself responsible only to God,[1] but in practice

[1] Cf. p. 103.

he is the most insistent that the Catholic Church is not a scattered mass of isolated communities exposed without defence to exterior dangers, and to interior perils. As a matter of fact the different churches came to form distinct groups of which the determining factors were partly of an historical, partly of a geographical, and above all of a religious nature. It goes without saying that an affiliated church would look upon itself to a certain degree as dependent upon the Mother Church which gave it birth. In this way all the churches of Africa went out from Carthage and all those of Egypt from Alexandria. This attitude is even more manifest in Central Italy. The Italian churches all claimed to have received the faith from Rome. It was Rome that they recognised as their sovereign. It was Rome, therefore, that from the earliest times consecrated the bishops chosen for these churches. This fact is pregnant of consequence. It is hardly possible that one bishop who appointed another should not have had a certain influence in the choice of a candidate, and certain immediate jurisdiction in cases of dispute. Matters were hardly different in Alexandria where the bishop appointed on his own responsibility all the pastors of the Egyptian churches. In other parts the direct authority of certain churches was limited to smaller areas. Some owed their primacy to the fact of having been founded by an apostle or of having had special relations with some famous personage of Christian antiquity. This was the case with Corinth and Thessalonica, both founded by Paul, of Ephesus where it appears that the apostle John lived for a long time, and of Antioch, once the dwelling-place of Paul and later of Peter. Other churches, simply

because they were situated in the capital of a civil province, came to be regarded as paramount by the surrounding Christian communities. Cæsarea in Palestine was for this reason the metropolis—if one may already make use of such a term—of Syrian Palestine, taking the lead even over Jerusalem, which, holding as it did the great souvenirs of the past, ought, it seems, to have enjoyed greater consideration. Thus were sketched between the years 200 and 250 the outlines of that ecclesiastical organisation which was to be completed at the beginning of the following century, and which was to find its final expression in the erection of the great patriarchates towards the middle of the fifth century. At the time of which we are speaking all this organisation was still in a state of embryo. Nevertheless the interdependence of the churches already appears in the rules which govern the appointment of the bishops as also in the manner in which the councils were convoked.

It is particularly in this latter matter that the solidarity of the different groups is manifested. It was recognised at an early date that an assembly of the most enlightened men was the best means of throwing light on knotty questions and preparing a solution of the same. Neighbouring bishops concerted together in order to consider the measures to be taken against suspicious religious movements and in order to bring about the much to be desired unity in religious usages. It stands to reason that the bishop of the most considerable church in such or such a region would usually take the initiative as to the preparation, direction and convocation of such conferences. There exists, of at least one of these ancient councils, the pretty complete minutes,

which allow us to follow the general course of the proceedings, the rôle of the president, the desires expressed by the bishop, and the final decisions, passed on this occasion with unanimity. This council was held in Carthage in 256 to regulate the much disputed question of the baptism of heretics, a question to which we shall have to return later on.

The Church of Rome.—It is unfortunately necessary to add that the council of Carthage just mentioned was in the mind of Cyprian, its president, intended to foil a decision of the Roman Church which the Christians of Africa felt they could not accept. Cyprian and his followers were opposing in this matter a fundamental principle, recognised at this period by all the churches and one to which Cyprian himself, in his serener moments, had given adherence. In truth the Roman Church was already in the middle of the third century considered by the entire Christian world to be the highest authority, and if one may so speak, the supreme court of appeal, to which, as a last resort, all disputes touching persons or doctrine might be referred. This conception dated back to the very beginnings of Christianity, and was founded chiefly on the fact that the Church of Rome was the Church of SS. Peter and Paul, in particular of the former, whose authority had passed on to those who succeeded him in the government of this community. These early leaders were persuaded that their solicitude was not limited to Rome, nor even those neighbouring churches founded on Italian soil, by the activity of Roman missioners; but that it extended to every place where the name of Jesus Christ was invoked. This is clearly to be seen in A.D. 90 and 100 when

the Roman Church intervened in the affairs of that of Corinth, either spontaneously or in answer to a direct appeal—we may safely use this term—made by the heads of this latter church, who were tormented by factions. In reading the solemn dedication prefixed by the martyr Ignatius to his epistle to the Romans in which titles abound exalting the great dignity of the Church of Rome, among others that of "President of Charity," we are led to conclude that the Roman Church was considered pre-eminent. We touch even more directly on this point when towards A.D. 180 St Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, puts forward the authority of traditional teaching in opposition to the heretical notions of individuals. Where could such traditional teaching be found, he asks, if not in the apostolic churches, the depositaries of true doctrine, and especially in the Church of Rome? "For it is with her that all the churches, that is the faithful wherever they be dispersed, should agree, because of her unique authority."

About the same time the bishop of Rome, Pope Victor, appears to give by his actions a practical commentary on the memorable words of the bishop of Lyons. For some time already two different observances with regard to the date at which Easter was to be celebrated had continued in opposition to each other within the Church. According to the Asiatics, who claimed in this matter a direct tradition from St John, the Christians ought to celebrate the Resurrection of the Saviour at the same date at which the Jews celebrated the Pasch, that is to say, on the day of the full moon of March; while the rest of the Church, having broken off all connexion with Jewish rites, celebrated

the feast on the Sunday following the day of the full moon. The two observances existed for a long time side by side, no effort being made to bridge the dividing difference, although it often enough caused inconvenience. A day came, however, when the Asiatics, finding themselves in the minority, strove to convert the bishop of Rome to their observance, hoping doubtless through him to gain the other churches. Towards A.D. 154 the aged bishop of Smyrna, St Polycarp, arrived in Rome, desirous of convincing Pope Anicetus of the legitimacy of the Eastern practice. The negotiations remained without result, each party holding his own ground, but the two bishops separated on good terms. Forty years later Pope Victor undertook to impose upon all parts of Asia the Roman observance which was that of the majority of the churches. Whatever may have been the reasons which determined his action it is certain that he sent word to the bishop of Ephesus, Polycrates, to convoke a synod of all the bishops of Asia in order to bring them to a uniform decision. It appears that Victor at the same time prescribed the meeting of synods in other countries and that these synods recognised in general the legitimacy of insisting on a universal application of the Roman usage. The Asiatics, however, obstinately held to their point, refusing to make any change in their observance. Pope Victor, strengthened by the adherence of the other communities, put an end to their resistance by cutting them off from the communion of the churches. This was hard, and even those who were of the same opinion as Pope Victor found that this exercise of power might have been dispensed with. Without contesting the

legitimacy of this pontifical act, Irenæus wrote to the Pope expressing the regret which the measure caused him. Was it necessary, he asked, for the sake of a mere question of discipline, to cut off from the communion of the Church these venerable communities of Christians, which could lay claim to apostolic tradition? The affair went no further, but such as it was it shows how the authority of the Roman Church stood at the end of the second century.

We should have the same impression if we studied the history of the Montanist movement, and the efforts made by its heads to obtain from the Roman Church an official recognition and letters of communion. This impression would be further strengthened by reading an account of that controversy relative to the baptism of heretics, which caused Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, to assume an attitude towards Rome that might have led to schism. It would be finally confirmed by the fact of the doctrinal intervention of Pope Denis in the Trinitarian question raised by Denis of Alexandria. In every way it is proved that from the most ancient times the different Christian communities, dispersed throughout the immensity of the Empire, recognised in the Church of Rome their religious centre and bond of unity.

The Catholic Church is not only a confederation of Christians having a common faith, it is a great institution in which the different functions are subordinate one to the other. It is a body possessing a visible head, the church of the apostle Peter.

The Mission of the Church.—It would be a mistake to see only in this great institution a complicated administrative machine, and to forget

the essential rôle of the Church. To continue the work of Christ, to sanctify souls, to lead them to salvation, such is the principal function of the Church, and it was this mission which inspired all its activity in the early ages.

The Church's Teaching.—Preaching was the first duty of the bishop. It was by preaching that he gained converts, that he confirmed the faith of those already converted, that he formed the young souls born into the Christian families. This preaching took as starting point the narrative and teaching contained in the Scriptures. Jews by origin, the apostles regarded as their proud possession the Holy Books, which had for so long edified and consoled Israel. Far from repudiating the Scriptures, they were, on the contrary, diligent in showing how the whole economy of salvation as manifested by Christ had been announced and prepared for by those Holy Books. In the primitive Christian communities, cradled for the most part within the shadow of the synagogue, the sacred books were still read, those books in which, up to that time, the Jews by race and their converts had found a rule of faith and of conduct. Doubtless the ceremonial law of the Old Testament as a whole was abandoned at a very early date, but there remained in the Scriptures a sufficient number of general precepts and of instructive episodes to supply fundamental subject matter for the new teaching. Broadly speaking, the primitive Church adopted the Greek Bible which was used universally throughout the diaspora, and which differed considerably in extent and text from the Hebrew Bible to which the scribes of Palestine were so jealously attached.

When the first preachers had, after the manner of the synagogues, read before the assembly different passages from the sacred books it remained for them to make known the way in which God had in later times realised the promises made to the patriarchs and prophets. These "Good Tidings," this message, was the narrative of the life and works of Jesus, and the explanation of the new precepts that He had brought to the world. For a certain time such teaching rested exclusively on oral tradition, but a day came when in different places, and under different influences, this message took the concrete form of written narratives of which the broad lines were more or less definitely fixed. In this way the different gospels had their origin. A certain number of them must have been in use already at a very early date. Finally a selection was made between those which the Church recognised as inspired from on high, and others of which the origin was more doubtful and obscure. In remote districts, not touched by the currents which affected the main body of the Church, some of these latter narratives continued to circulate and others were even written at a later date of which fragments have come down to us.

In many communities, besides the gospels, letters or epistles, formerly received from one or other of the apostles or from some person of importance, were also read. In this way the letters of Paul were preserved in Thessalonica, in Corinth, and in Rome, and from these churches copies of the letters were passed on to the neighbouring communities. In this way also collections of apostolic letters came into being, chiefly the Pauline epistles. It is easy to understand that the contents of these collections

could not from the beginning be absolutely fixed. But towards the middle of the second century, in the same way that the canon of the gospels had been given almost everywhere its last and definite form, so the canon of the epistles—with its two parts, the Pauline epistles and the Catholic epistles—had by degrees become established. To these were joined at an early hour the book of the Acts to which in many communities was added the Apocalypse of St John. In this way, the Sacred Scriptures of the New Law were compiled, parallel to those of the Old Law. As regarded their authoritative value no difference was made between the two: divine inspiration was recognised as the ultimate source of the one as of the other.

The Scriptures could not, however, suffice in themselves for the instruction of the faithful. It was necessary that a living interpretation should meet unceasingly the ever new needs of the congregations. The Bible furnished the general theme of the instruction as well as a set of more or less happily selected examples. Its efficacy as a means of religious formation was further increased by the application of the exegetic process known as allegory, which made it possible to draw from the text an incredible variety of practical lessons. This process of allegory was not, it is true, of Christian origin—it had flourished first among the Greeks and then among the Alexandrine Jews—but within the Church it was destined to a far more extensive use than it had ever known before. There were many passages in the Bible of which the apparent meaning was so commonplace as to seem unworthy of the inspired character of the Sacred Book. In these cases it was deemed necessary to break

through the dry rind of the letter in order to find the spirit and to draw forth from the text its mystic sense. By this method explanations were arrived at of which some seem bewildering to us to-day, while others have more or less survived. We are not left merely to conjecture the methods used by the heads of the different communities in applying the Scriptures to the needs of the faithful. Among the numerous writings of Origen many of the homilies are still preserved which he delivered before the community of Cæsarea. They are intended to explain the whole sequence of the Old and New Testaments, and this survey of the entire history of salvation gave the orator ample opportunity for passing in review before his audiences the most diverse problems of Christian faith and morals.

Side by side with this popular teaching, intended for the masses, the Church was, by the force of circumstances, led to organise a more complete and systematic exposition of Christian doctrine, destined to meet the needs of an intellectual élite. At first certain private individuals, acting on their own responsibility, occupied themselves with this form of teaching. At Rome for instance, towards the middle of the second century, Justinus, a philosopher who had become converted to Christianity, gathered round him disciples whom he instructed in a new philosophy entirely penetrated with religion. Other similar schools, however, of which traces may be found in the capital from this time on right into the middle of the third century, do not seem to have left an equally satisfactory impression upon the ecclesiastical authorities. Without speaking of certain schools which were frankly heretical, we find others in which more or less suspicious explana-

tions were given to Christian doctrine. We shall have reason to refer to these again later on. In Alexandria, on the contrary, the Christian school remained under the immediate direction of the Church. At first simply an extension of the catechetical school, designed for the first formation of neophytes, it developed towards the last years of the second century into a centre of culture and learning, where all the different forms of philosophic discipline were brought into the service of the Christian faith. During the whole of the third century this school of Alexandria stood in the highest repute. Under masters such as Clement, Origen, Denis, it was frequented not only by the faithful but also by pagans, and drew students even from distant parts. At one time Origen, obliged to leave the Egyptian capital, made of Cæsarea in Palestine another Alexandria. Antioch also, in the last years of the century, found in Lucian another Origen, who made of the capital of Syria a brilliant centre of religious thought. But here as in Cæsarea, or in Rome, we have to deal rather with private initiative than with establishments founded, administered or at least superintended by the Church.

The Sacraments.—To preach is not everything. The saving mission of the Church exercised itself especially in dispensing divine life to the faithful by means of the sacraments. Immediately after the first Pentecost we see the apostles admitting the new believers to their little society by the ceremony of baptism. We see them—no longer content with the rites celebrated in the Temple—grouping the faithful in private houses for the ceremony of the Breaking of Bread. These two rites, to which from

the very beginning particular importance was attached, were to remain the two poles controlling the current of Christian life. Baptism is the rite of initiation, and as it was usually administered to adults (the administration of baptism to children in Christian families seems to have been unusual except in danger of death) it had to be preceded by a time of preparation. Those undergoing this preparation were called catechumens. It was a time of apprenticeship on the one hand, in which the candidate for baptism was supposed to acquire a knowledge of religious truth; it was also a time of probation during which the ecclesiastical authorities could carefully examine the conduct of the catechumen and calculate the chances of his becoming a serious neophyte. This discipline of the catechumens, slowly elaborated during the first two centuries, assumed at the beginning of the third those general features which were retained for a long time afterwards. As we have said above, the instruction, at least in the larger communities, was given in a sort of school strictly subordinate to ecclesiastical authority. The intellectual and moral preparation was intensified in the weeks immediately preceding baptism, that is to say, before the feast of Easter, at which time, from the earliest ages of Christianity, the solemn rite of collective initiation took place. A catechumen in danger of death was, of course, exempted from all delay and was baptised privately without the ceremonies which accompanied the collective administration of the sacrament.

Around the principal rite of baptism, which consisted generally of immersion accompanied by a triple confession of faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, certain accessory ceremonies

were developed at an early hour which are still more or less recognisable in our modern ritual. Such are the solemn blessing of the baptismal font, the anointing of the bodies of the catechumens with oil, the renouncing of Satan with his works and pomps. After the baptised person came out of the water he was brought to the bishop, who anointed him on the forehead with perfumed oil. From Tertullian we learn that this last act was considered a rite of sovereign importance, and one which conferred the Holy Spirit. Although at that time included in the baptismal ceremonies, this anointing, consignment as it was then called, was unmistakably the same act that we recognise later under the name of "Confirmation." The ceremony of initiation was completed—no matter what the age of the neophyte might be—by participation in the Eucharistic mysteries, which the newly baptised were then allowed for the first time to contemplate in their entirety. We cannot describe even briefly here the different stages by which the primitive "Breaking of Bread"—which in the very early days was, at least in some communities, celebrated in the course of an actual meal—was transformed into the rite which the writers of the second century describe. Probably everything that recalled a material meal disappeared at an early date. As described for us by St Justin in the year 150 this rite of the Eucharist resembled at that time much more the Mass of to-day than the primitive "Agape." Prayers, reading, hymns, then the thanksgiving over the elements to be consecrated—bread and wine mixed with water—and finally communion under the two species. But the belief was the same whether in the time of the apostles, or of St Justin, or in our own. The

Eucharistic bread and wine were no longer ordinary food and drink. The participation of these elements brought the communicant into intimate touch with the Flesh and Blood of the Saviour. This act of consecration and the reception of the Eucharist together with the prayers of thanksgiving which accompanied them was, and is, the great prayer of the Church, the true sacrifice of the Christian religion. The Eucharist was celebrated on the Sundays. At a very early date the Church had substituted for the sanctification of the Sabbath, so rigorously prescribed by the Mosaic law, the first day of the week, sacred to the memory of the Saviour's resurrection.

It was at the Eucharistic reunions that the promotion to different orders of the hierarchy—of persons appointed by previous suffrage, or by choice of the bishops—took place on certain fixed days. From apostolic times, the imposition of hands, made by the disciples of Jesus and by the first preachers of the gospel, had been the sign which separated those called to the sacred functions from the lay members of the community. This act has always remained the essential part of the ceremony of ordination. It was accompanied by prayers which varied according to the different orders conferred. Of such prayers a Roman version has, it appears, been recently found which dates back at least to the beginning of the third century. It is to be noted that the rank of those who imposed hands varied according to the order to be conferred. A bishop could be consecrated only by other bishops, hence the necessity of appealing to the neighbouring churches in the case of an episcopal ordination. When it was a question of ordinary

priests, it was the bishop, accompanied by the whole "presbyterium," who, according to a very ancient usage, imposed hands on those who were to receive orders. The deacons, on the other hand, were ordained by the bishop alone. The inferior ministers did not receive any ordination properly speaking, they were appointed by the bishop in the presence of the assembly, who gave them the insignia of the functions which they were to fulfil.

Such are the sacred ceremonies which attract most attention and of which it is possible to trace the rites back even to the first centuries. There were of course others, but they have left less definite traces. If, for example, it is certain that the Church at a very early date made laws about marriage and surrounded this contract with ceremonies, yet it is impossible to say what the ceremonies were in those remote times. In the same way it is not exactly known in what way the anointing of the sick, of which St James speaks, was carried out. It is at least known that from the third century—doubtless already much earlier—the oil that was to serve for functions was blessed at the Eucharistic meetings. The Church also surrounded the burial of her children with prayer. The bodies sanctified by the sacred mysteries were regarded as but fallen asleep in the hope of a glorious resurrection, and were laid in the cemeteries (*coimeterion*: dormitory) either subterranean (the catacombs) or in the open air. The souls were recommended to God both in common prayer and during the great Eucharistic prayer.

Such were the ordinary means employed by the ancient Church in the initiation of her faithful, in communicating to them from day to day the

necessary graces, and in conferring upon them in the most solemn moments of their lives the aid of which they stood in need. Carefully tried in the catechumenate, prepared by this noviceship for the holy life of which they would make profession in baptism, fortified by the frequent reception of the Eucharist, kept on the alert by the prospect of possible martyrdom, her children were well prepared to carry into effect the desire which the Church expressed when she gave them the white robe of the neophyte, telling them to keep it without stain until the day when they could wear it before the tribunal of Jesus Christ. It was hoped that the failings inseparable from human weakness could be easily expiated by prayer, fasting and almsdeeds. It appears that in the beginning the Church was in no hurry systematically to use the power which she was conscious of having received from her Divine Master of remitting sins. She made large use of this power in baptism, she knew that it could be applied even in the case of grave sin after baptism, and she made use of it in exceptional cases. But it was only somewhat later that the Church thought of codifying the rules to be applied to the remission of grave transgressions.

It is hard to say when this code was established and what it contained. We are, however, justified in concluding that in the second half of the second century two opposed currents made themselves felt in the Church: one of extreme rigorism which pretended that Christians who fell gravely after baptism should not count upon the pardon of the Church, which ejected them from her bosom; the other, more human and nearer to the evangelical spirit, contented itself by imposing upon the culpable

rude penances with a view to preparing them for that reconciliation with the Church which was to be the symbol and gage of their reconciliation with God. This went far to prepare the organisation of the penitential discipline as known later on in the Church. This discipline, which applied only to grave faults, consisted chiefly in this, that the Christian convicted either by denunciation or by his own avowal of grave sin, was separated for a certain time, differing according to circumstance, from the communion of the faithful, was deprived of the sacred mysteries and subjected to hard penitential exercises—to humiliating and painful acts—until the day when, by the imposition of the bishop's hands, he was solemnly reintroduced into the company of perfect Christians. This public penance, which must not be mistaken for public confession, assured the sinner that he might hope for reconciliation at some earlier or later date. The question arises: Could all sins, whatever their gravity, be pardoned by this final reconciliation? We cannot say. In practice there seems to have been but little uniformity.

It would appear none the less that in the last years of the second century a wave of rigorism passed over the Church, a repercussion probably of the Montanist movement which had developed more and more in Asia. Tolerably concordant testimony, from Carthage (Tertullian), from Rome (Hippolytus), from Alexandria (Origen), goes to prove the existence of a very severe practice by which ecclesiastical pardon was not granted for the crimes of idolatry, adultery, and homicide. Christians guilty of these crimes were admitted to penance but without the hope of obtaining, even at the hour

of death, reconciliation with the Church and participation in the Eucharist. After a time reconciliation was admitted for certain carnal sins. It is even probable that different bishops issued declarations on this subject which irritated the rigorists. Tertullian in his "De Pudicitia" relates with much indignation, if not the words at least the spirit of such a decree, issued according to Tertullian by a "bishop of bishops" (*episcopus episcoporum*) who appears to have been no other than Pope Callistus. This latter was notably accused by Hippolytus of having facilitated the reconciliation of those who did not deserve pardon. But these protestations did not impede the more lenient interpretation from gaining ground. It appears that in the middle of the third century it was the rule in most of the churches to admit to pardon those guilty of sundry carnal sins. This was made one of the arguments upon which a plea was founded after the Decian persecution for showing mercy also to those Christians, all too numerous, who had fallen away during the persecution and made more or less formal declarations of idolatry. It was then agreed in many of the larger churches, in Rome and Carthage, to submit these backsliders (*lapsi*) to penance and to give them hope of obtaining at a not very remote date a definite reconciliation. This example was imitated more or less everywhere, but a schism, the issue in large measure of personal questions, rallied once more the partisans of rigorism. The Novatian Church, so called after its founder Novatian, carried on, even to the middle of the fifth century, the theory and practice of "Unpardonable sins." Even outside this schismatic group there were not wanting

adherents of the older school of rigorism. The canons of a council held towards the end of the third century at Elvira (Granada) still refused to pardon even at the hour of death several sins falling under the categories of the three capital sins. But if they bear testimony to a past which had disappeared, the canons of Elvira cannot be taken to represent the general penitential discipline of the time in which they were drawn up. From the existing evidence it seems that generally only one penance was allowed and that even at the hour of death many local churches would not admit to reconciliation one who had fallen twice in this way.

By this severe discipline, and by the means of sanctification which she offered to her children, the Church assured a development of spiritual life and a piety of which the manifestations, rare as they are in the documents which survive, are not, for that, the less touching and edifying. Let it suffice to mention here the inscription of the Phrygian bishop Abercius, and especially the inscription of Pectorius d'Autun, one of the jewels of the Church of Gaul. This inscription is worthy to rank beside that famous letter in which the Christians of Lyons tell of the martyrdom suffered by their brethren in A.D. 177.

CHAPTER IV

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES

Heresies—Gnoticism—Marcionism—The Trinitarian Controversy—Montanism—The Novatians—The Dispute about Baptism.

THE greatest dangers which threatened the Church at this period of its beginnings did not come from without, from Imperial Rome or from hostile action; they came from within, in the form of heresies tending to vitiate the purity of doctrine, introducing discord into the Christian family, and attacking the fundamental principles which governed the hierarchy. Heresies and schisms had one good result however, they led the Church to make her teaching precise and to become more definitely conscious of the origin and extent of her power.

The Heresies.—We must first of all establish an important distinction between the many doctrinal aberrations which threatened the purity of Catholic teaching during the first three centuries. Certain heresies attacked the entirety of Christian doctrine claiming to superimpose upon the simplicity of evangelical teaching a superior science or gnosis, and affecting to expound the supposed esoteric doctrines of Christianity. All these aberrations are

known under the generic term of Gnostic systems, or simply as Gnosticism. The first traces of these tendencies go back to apostolic times, but they reached their fullest development in the middle of the second century. At this time their followers established dissenting chapels, and even distinct churches which set themselves up as rivals to the great Christian Church. The other group of heretical tendencies, dangerous to doctrine though in a less degree, turned upon special points in the traditional teaching of the Church, and led, if not always to definite heresy, at least to vehement controversy. Among the most important of these tendencies was that which occupied itself with the relations between the Father and the Son in the bosom of the one and undivided Trinity. This began towards the end of the second century, and raged during the whole of the third century, preparing thus for the outburst which was to take place in the fourth century immediately after the cessation of persecution.

Gnosticism.—The beginnings of the Gnostic movement are shrouded in mystery. The writings of the New Testament show us that there existed from the beginning among some of the faithful a tendency to subtilise the teaching, too simple in their idea, of the first preachers of the gospel; that there existed even then, a religious curiosity eager to raise questions on different points of apostolical teaching: such as, the possible return of the Saviour (*parousia*); the relation between Christianity and the Jewish law; the personality of Jesus. These speculations, lawful in themselves, could give rise to abuses, and we see the apostles pre-

occupied in forestalling the errors they might lead to. The Epistle to the Ephesians insists upon the rôle of the Church in the acquisition of that superior science (*epignosis*) after which some were striving. The pastoral letters impugn violently certain false doctors and their Judaical fables and interminable genealogies of celestial spirits. The same note of indignation is evident in the Epistle of St Jude, in the second Epistle of St Peter, and in the shorter epistles inserted before the Apocalypse. A little later, at the beginning of the second century, the letters of Ignatius of Antioch warn the faithful in Asia against the dangers of a heresy in which various strange elements appear to have mingled, the chief error resembling that of the "Docetæ" who maintained that Jesus was man, not in reality, but only in seeming. The insistence with which Ignatius asserts and reasserts the unity of essence of the Father and that of Christ leads us to suppose that there was also a tendency to separate the God of the Old Testament from the God of the New. As a matter of fact we shall soon come across a heresy of which these two traits form the essential characteristic.[1] These indications, vague as they are, go to prove at least the existence of different systems of speculation; some of them syncretist, built up upon a Jewish basis but out of which grew doctrines foreign to Judaism, and others more intransigent, and radical, tending to nothing less than the severing of the historic bond which united the religion of Jesus to that of the patriarchs and prophets. However dissimilar these heresies might be, they had nevertheless one feature in common: speculation as to the nature of evil. The minds

[1] Cf. p. 87.

which propagated them were preoccupied in a supreme degree with the problem of evil, and they all tried to establish an incompatibility between created nature, source of all moral and physical misery, and the God of infinite goodness revealed by the gospels. According to the centres in which they worked the doctors developed their theories in various ways. Among minds impregnated with Jewish monotheism and incapable of departing from this fundamental principle, Gnosticism represented creation as the work of inferior spirits, in revolt against God, or at least in ignorance of Him, whereas among others, who had emancipated themselves from this great truth, and who were predestined by their pagan descent to the follies of polytheism, Gnosticism did not hesitate to install, even in the heart of what they still believed to be Christianity, the most impossible chimeras of paganism.

Although it appears at first sight that we have abundant information about the Syrian charlatans, who from the middle of the first century began to dogmatise, yet upon closer inspection we find that it is impossible to reconstitute, without risk of falling into grievous error, the systems that they propagated. In spite of the apparent wealth of detail with which Catholic controversialists of the end of the second century speak of them, they can hardly tell us more than the names of such men as Simon Magus, Meander, and Saturnilus. All that can be affirmed with regard to these men is that they represented Creation as the work of powers, emanating from God no doubt, but in revolt against Him: powers which had succeeded in capturing and holding here below a fragment of

divine life, which was finally to be set free again by the intervention of the all powerful God. All this was bound to lead to a sort of mythology, which must have appeared an abomination to well-grounded Christians, but which did not fail to make appeal in Syria, the home of every form of syncretism, and to gain a certain number of adepts.

In order to impose this mythology upon wider circles it was necessary to clothe it in a philosophic equipment, capable of masking the incoherence of the primitive conception. This, it appears, was first done with success at Alexandria. At any rate the Catholic heresiographers are pleased to insist upon the part taken in the development of these theories by certain thinkers of Egyptian origin, or who had sojourned in Egypt: Valentine—Basilides —Carpocrates. In these circles in which Platonic philosophy was being revived, speculation was inclined to run riot on those more or less inherent " ideas " by which Plato had sought to explain the visible world. The Gnostics of Alexandria gave to these ideas, if one may so speak, an embodied form. They made of them a kind of entity, and even went so far as to determine their origin and evolution, either by grouping the said " ideas " in couples and pretending that from the union of such a couple new ideas might be born (system of Valentine), or else by giving a long exposition of the successive emanations of the different " ideas " (system of Basilides). All these speculations, for which a whole generation of able thinkers was impassioned, to-day hardly seem worthy of even a detailed exposition. Besides, it would be a mistake to think that it was in these

superabstractions that the enormous appeal of these systems was to be found. In reality, what the numerous public which followed these schools sought to find in them was an answer to the eternal questions: " How comes evil into this world which ecclesiastical tradition, in accordance with the Jewish Bible, presents as the work of a Being both good and powerful? Whence comes the apparent opposition between the precepts of Christian morality and many facts in the Old Testament described as of divine origin? How explain the gulf between the ideal of which we unceasingly dream and the ugly reality that weighs us down? " Such were, as we can see, by one of the clearest of the Gnostic writings, the letter addressed to a lady by a Gnostic doctor, Ptolemæus, the questions to which the Gnostics claimed to find answers. The abstruse theories which the opponents of Gnosticism gladly retail as a proof of its absurdity, had in reality no other motive than to show the gradual degradations by which the creative idea had to pass before it could rest in sordid reality. The misfortune was that by all these absurdities traditional Christianity was emptied of its reality. The simple tellings of the gospel could in no way be adapted to this phantasmagoria: Christ's person was more and more lost sight of; the work of redemption was often regarded as nothing more than a manifestation of superior knowledge enabling the initiated to save themselves without any effort. As regards the moral outlook of the Gnostics, it continually vacillated between an asceticism which aimed at destroying the body, and an antinomianism which refused to consider as sins the worst moral abberrations. Whatever may have been the doctrine of

the doctors of Gnosticism it cannot be denied that certain Gnostic sects enjoyed a firmly established reputation for immorality.

Marcionism.—It is remarkable how, proceeding from Antioch or Alexandria, the different Gnostic theories penetrated about A.D. 130-140 to Rome, where they sought to gain new adherents. Indeed it is chiefly through the Western doctors Irenæus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, that we hear of Gnosticism, and we can only surmise, without being able to demonstrate, that these theories were intimately connected with the religious syncretisms of the East. It was also in Rome in July A.D. 144 that a definite rupture took place between the Church and a man who was to give his name to a rival church, far more redoubtable to Christianity than the secret lodges of the Gnostic doctors. This was Marcion, who was to reduce to certain simple formulæ, accessible to the people, the essential ideas which were hidden under the complicated systems of contemporary heresies. If he desired like the Gnostics to solve the religious problems of which we have spoken, he wished to solve them in a different way, without having recourse to subtleties, and so to meet the understanding of the ignorant. Whether he was in any way connected with the movement, which in Asia occupied the attention of Ignatius of Antioch, and later of Polycarp of Smyrna, we do not know. It is possible that Marcion was more dependent upon interior movements than his recent biographer is ready to allow. Be that as it may, he had certainly one merit, that of conceiving strongly, and expressing simply the fundamental ideas of

his religious system. Paul had understood that Christianity constituted in relation to the Old Law a new economy of salvation. Marcion represented himself as the disciple of Paul, ready to bring back to its primitive purity the teaching of the apostle, adulterated from the beginning by the impenitent Judaism of the first disciples and their successors. But Marcion went much further than Paul, for Paul although he considered the Old Law as abolished, yet accepted the whole of the Old Testament as a figure and preparation of the new economy. The reformer of the second century wished to cut all the links which united the religion of Christ with that of the prophets, of Moses, and the patriarchs. According to Marcion the Old Testament was the work and manifestation of a just, but limited Creator, who was the deity of the Jews; a deity who could not be identified with the infinitely good Father, as revealed by the gospels, whose representative Jesus was. According to Marcion this Father stood outside the created world, with which he had nothing in common; but, moved by compassion for the miseries of the creatures of the just God, he undertook to deliver them. Jesus came on earth, a man only in appearance, without having passed through the humiliations of birth and growth, and manifested himself for the first time, in the fullness of manhood, in the synagogue of Tiberius. His preaching had no other end than to destroy the reign of the just God, by suppressing his precepts, and correcting the evil he had brought about. Put to death by the representatives of the Jewish law, emissaries of the just God, Christ descended into Hell and delivered the dead who believed in him, and especially those

who had been condemned by the Creator—God. In the same way Christ was ready, according to Marcion, to deliver from this horrible bondage all those who would henceforward believe in him; on the day of final consummation, their souls (not their bodies) would be saved from the last annihilation which was reserved for the impenitent adherents of the just God, and finally for this God himself.

For the Marcionite the essential thing was to believe in Jesus and to hold in check the Creator —God. This was to be done by abstaining as much as possible from nourishment which was his gift, and from marriage which continued his work. Brutally encratistic as it was, Marcionism remained accessible to a small number, for those only were admitted to baptism who had made a vow to observe the essential precepts of which we have spoken. None the less a large number of catechumens were enrolled, who, while waiting for a favourable opportunity of becoming "perfect Christians," strengthened in the meantime the force of the movement.

For the usage of the church which he had founded, in opposition to the Catholic Church, Marcion drew up a new Testament of his own, which comprised the gospel according to St Luke, and the Epistles of St Paul (the same which the Church recognises with the exception of the pastorals and the Epistle to the Hebrews). He even revised and corrected the sacred texts he had chosen in a most arbitrary manner, omitting all allusions to the Old Testament. This "instrumentum" or basic text was complemented by a work of Marcion's called the "Antithesis" in which he paints in the crudest colours all the

apparent contradictions between the Old Testament and the gospel message. Provided with these "Sacred Books" and preserving the general organisation of the Catholic Church, together with its ritual and practices, the Marcionite church spread with immense rapidity in the East and West. One can judge of its success by the great number of refutations which the Catholic controversialists found it necessary to undertake against it. The movement seems to have been arrested in the West towards the middle of the third century, but it lasted much longer in the East, where however, from the beginning of the fourth century, it showed a tendency to be merged in Manichæism, of which the teaching on many points was similar.

The Trinitarian Controversies.—Gnosticism and Marcionism had this in common, that they both rejected in its entirety the traditional conception of Christianity. Their attacks, reacting on the teaching of the Church, forced its doctors to elaborate a veritable theology, a doctrinal system, reposing, it is true, upon the premises of the older ecclesiastical teaching, but seeking to make a synthesis out of these first principles, building them up into an organic whole, and eliminating the difficulties raised by some of these assertions. It was not enough to oppose to the heterodox the simplicity of the gospels; it was necessary, in order to meet them on their own ground, to oppose to their "Gnosis" a corresponding Christian science.

This work did not progress without certain difficulties. Even when it was done under the supervision of the authorities of the Church, it could lead to mistakes, still more so, when it was

carried out without any ecclesiastical mandate, and by persons of uncertain competence. This was only too clearly shown by the agitation produced by the debates touching the definition of the relation between Jesus the Son of God and His heavenly Father.

"Christ is God." The whole primitive church affirmed this truth, and the Christ whose divinity was thus proclaimed was not the vague and impersonal son of the Gnostic "pleroma," but the historical personage of whom profession of faith was made at baptism, declaring that He had been born, had suffered, had died and risen again. Everyone within the Church was of one accord in this affirmation of the divinity of Christ. It was expressed in the sermons of the clergy, and in the hymns in which from the beginning the simpler among the flock honoured the Man God. The point at which the differences of opinion began to be felt was when an explanation was sought of the manner in which Christ, who had appeared here on earth in the form of a man, was also God; in other words, when it became necessary to specify the relation of the divine and the human elements in Jesus Christ. The Christian faith had inherited from the Jews the strictest form of monotheism, and the attacks of the Gnostics had but strengthened this belief. How then was it possible to speak of Jesus Christ as God while proclaiming at the same time the divinity of the one and only Creator? How were monotheism and the belief in the divinity of the Saviour both to be safeguarded? We, who possess formulæ, which if they do not explain this mystery, at least circumscribe it in a precise manner, can hardly imagine to-day the difficulties into which

these questions must have led the doctors of past ages. This inexperience explains how during some time the thought of many vacillated between two extremes. "Monarchianism" which would sacrifice the Trinity of persons to the divine Unity, and a sort of "Tritheism" (better said perhaps a "Ditheism") more or less masked, which tended to sacrifice the divine Unity to the distinction of persons.

"There is but one God" was the cry of the defenders of the divine Monarchy. This God is evidently the heavenly Father, Creator of Heaven and earth. And so, among these defenders of the divine Monarchy, some were to be found who, in order to uphold the divine Unity, minimised the divinity of the Saviour, even so far as to make it disappear altogether. Modern critics give the name of "Dynamist monarchianism" to this tendency which led later to a clearly defined heresy, known as adoptionism. According to this heresy Jesus is certainly God, but by adoption he was in fact a man, whom God adopted to be His son, elevating him to divine rank. Ideas somewhat resembling these, could, it would appear, circulate towards the middle of the third century without causing scandal. They are to be found, expressed in veiled form, and apparently in good faith, in the "Pastor" of Hermas. But from the day when they were crudely expressed in Rome by the mouth of one Theodotus, a rich tanner, they were at once proscribed by Pope Victor. It could not be otherwise, such ideas being but the echo of the Judaising Ebionite heresy, the fate of which had long before been determined by the Church. Rejected by the Roman community, Theodotus,

the leather dresser, founded a dissenting chapel, in which he was joined by another Theodotus, a banker by profession. For this chapel Theodotus succeeded in procuring the ministry of a former confessor of the faith. This chapel soon transformed itself into a school where religious learning was cultivated with the aid of Aristotelean dialectics, to which was added merciless Bible criticism. A little later, about the year 220, a certain Artemas still represented this heresy in Rome. He endeavoured to show, by an appeal to history, that the adoptionist theory was the ancient and authentic Christian doctrine. But at that time the influence of this school had grown negligible, two other tendencies disputing the favour of the public.

The more ancient of these, which was much in vogue in cultivated circles, took as the starting point of its speculations the clear teaching of the prologue of the gospel of St John. Jesus is God because " He is the Word of God made flesh and dwelling amongst us." This prologue enounced clearly the origin from all eternity of the Word, His rôle of Creator, His function of enlightener. Nothing better could be said on the subject, but the difficulty began when it was thought necessary to specify the relations between the Word and God, " with whom He was in the beginning." The first Christian philosophers to treat of this delicate subject too readily likened the Word, the Logos of the fourth gospel, to the Logos of Greek thought, especially that of the Platonists. To these latter the Logos is essentially the dwelling-place of the divine " ideas " and at the same time the demiurgus and architect of the universe. His rôle being above all cosmological, the emission not to say produc-

tion of the Logos was linked with the act of creation. Following up this conception the Christian apologists, Theophilus or Athenagorus for instance, distinguished more or less clearly two states of the divine Word. In the beginning He was nothing more than the still impersonal thought of God, the immanent Word (Logos *endiathétos*); when, however, God decided to create, He began by emitting, uttering, the Word, which thus became subsistent and the instrument of creation (Logos *prophoricos*). Under the second form the "Word" is called by Justin a "second God."

The drawbacks of such a system are only too apparent. The emission of the Word being represented as the first act of creation, was there not a risk of considering the Word as the first of creatures? What becomes on this view of the divinity of the Saviour, the Incarnate Word? From such subordinationism—more or less latent—refuge was taken in strong affirmations, which, however, did not fit in with the general plan of the system. The interpretation given to numerous passages of the Old Testament relating to divine apparitions, "theophanies" as they were called, is hardly reassuring. The adherents of the system refused to regard these apparitions as manifestations of the Father. Infinitely transcending the created world the Father could not enter into relations with it. The Word in consequence appears as a necessary intermediary between the Father and us; in a word as a God of inferior rank. Even if this great difficulty could be eliminated by verbal subtleties, another difficulty remained, a more or less veiled ditheism which nothing could get over; and, in the midst of all these speculations, what was to become

of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit who had always been associated with the Father and the Son in the baptismal formula? In spite of all these difficulties this theology of the Logos had gained the suffrage of a number of Christian thinkers; during the second century the apologists Justin, Athenagoras, and Theophilus laid down the broad lines of this mode of thought; it was professed in the third century by such men as Tertullian, Hippolytus and Origen, and a little later by Novatian and Denis of Alexandria; all imposing names, and among the most illustrious in ancient ecclesiastical history.

These abstruse speculations hardly spread beyond the limits of the schools. The general mass of Christians inclined rather to another explanation, apparently more religious, but which in reality tended towards a definite error known under the name of "modalism." When the ordinary Christians, who had no need to worry about theology, spoke of Jesus, they called Him the "good God" without troubling themselves to inquire how exactly He was to be distinguished from the Father. If we reason round this appellation we arrive at affirming—and that was actually what came to pass—that the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit only correspond to different aspects, different "modalities" or passing rôles, assumed by the Divine Being, and in no way to a reality of persons. God was called the Father; as Redeemer, He was called the Son; as Sanctifier, He was called the Holy Spirit. If pressed, the representatives of this theory could be forced to say in the last instance that it was the Father who had suffered on the cross; hence came the title "Patripassians" which their adversaries gave them.

Expressed thus crudely the modalist doctrine flatly contradicted the traditional creed. But it was possible to present it under a disguised form, simply as an affirmation of the divinity of Christ, and this as an antidote to the rationalistic negations of the school of Theodotus. It is probable that the propaganda made in its favour in Rome during the last years of the second century by a certain Praxeas hardly excited any suspicion at first, because this was the time when Theodotus had just been condemned by Pope Victor. In Asia things went less well for the Modalists. During the first years of the third century Noet of Smyrna was twice called before the ecclesiastical authorities of his native town and made to give an account of doctrines condemned as distinctly modalist. On the second occasion he was excommunicated. At about the same time Praxeas, having crossed over to Africa, was vigorously attacked by Tertullian, who obliged him to retract. Praxeas, however, relapsed into his errors, and this gave the fiery apologist occasion to write his treatise "Adversus Praxean," which is our principal source of information with regard to this modalist movement.

In Rome in the meantime the danger increased; a disciple of Noet, Epigone, who had come from Asia, founded a school of religious instruction, of which his pupil Cleomanos soon took over the direction. He was seconded by a certain Sabellius, who was to give his name to this modalist heresy. Pope Zephyrinus (202-218) who, it appears, was not *au courant* with the theological questions of the hour, did not—at least according to the testimony of his enemies—at once discover the dangerous aspects of these theories, which were admittedly

put forward with much circumspection by their adherents. Discernment, however, was not lacking in a Roman doctor, the presbyter Hippolytus, who was at that time one of the most considerable personages in the Roman Church. Saturated, as he himself was, with the theology of the Logos, he instantly begged the Pope to forbid the faithful to frequent the school of Cleomenos. The Pope, however, shrewd enough to see the drawbacks presented on the other hand by the theories developed by Hippolytus, and encouraged by his archdeacon Callistus, who, for his part, did not seem to recognise the modalist danger, could not bring himself to consent to this measure. In 218 Pope Zephyrinus died. Hippolytus counted on being his successor, but it was Callistus who was elected. Hippolytus then entered into schism declaring loudly that he did not wish to live in communion with a heretical pope. In this way a dissenting community was founded, which appears to have drawn a certain number of adherents. Callistus, in order to put an end to the grievance against himself, excommunicated Sabellius, who left Rome and retired to Lybia. But the Roman schism continued even after the death of Callistus, and under Popes Urban and Pontianus. The persecution of Maximin in A.D. 235 led to the simultaneous arrest of the two ecclesiastical leaders: Pontianus and Hippolytus were both relegated to the mines of Sardinia. There is every reason to believe that they were reconciled during the time of their common misfortune, and according to an epitaph, found at Damascus, Hippolytus is supposed to have advised his adherents to join the Roman communion. It is certain that under Pope Fabian (236-250), the

persecution being over, the bodies of the two martyrs were brought back to Rome and solemnly buried. Hippolytus's final confession of faith had fully exonerated him in the eyes of the Roman Church. Besides, towards the middle of the third century, the Trinitarian controversies cooled down in the West. In the East, on the other hand, some significant incidents show that the disputes were far from being at an end. We shall study these incidents later on as a prelude to the great controversy of the fourth century, keeping our attention for the moment upon the discussions which agitated the Church between the end of the second and the middle of the third centuries.

Montanism.—The Montanist question, the oldest of all, came into being even before the Trinitarian controversy. The name of Montanist is given to a widespread illuminist movement which took its rise in Phrygia in the second half of the second century. Several persons, chief among them one Montanus, with his two wives Priscilla and Maximilla, believed themselves called, by a revelation of the Holy Spirit, to renew and purify the Church, and to prepare it for the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth. They knew the exact spot near the village of Papuza where the celestial Jerusalem was to descend, and repairing thither, the new prophets drew with them huge crowds, to whom they preached an absolute renunciation of all the goods of this world, marriage included, as having become useless in face of the approaching Kingdom of God. The coming of Christ not taking place at the time which had been indicated, it became necessary to adopt some more

positive programme. An earthly Jerusalem was organised. Papuza became the Holy place, the city of the Paraclete, from whence the good tidings spread all over Asia. More practically minded men succeeded the primitive leaders of this movement, who it seems had already disappeared before the year 180. These new leaders took every precaution to ensure success to the movement set going by Montanus.

In this movement there was, as a matter of fact, no question of doctrinal aberration. The first Montanists conformed in belief to the orthodox creed of that period, and their teaching was above all moral, intended to draw souls from the lukewarmness and the deadliness of daily well-being. The prospect of a final consummation close at hand demanded a strict asceticism, martyrdom being presented as the ideal which every Christian should have continually before his eyes. Fasts were frequent and severe, and if marriage was not actually condemned (the Montanists were afraid by uttering such a condemnation to appear to have joined hands with the Gnostics) it was but little esteemed, and second marriage was rigorously forbidden. In all this there was nothing radically heterodox, and one can understand the perplexity of the ecclesiastical authorities brought face to face with this movement in which there was nevertheless cause for alarm. What disgusted these authorities most was the dominating character of the " new prophets." Each of these illumined ones regarded himself as an oracle of the Holy Spirit and expected his revelations to be accepted without question. The Montanists even went so far as to seek to impose these individual revelations as a supplement to traditional faith.

There was danger in this, not to speak of the contempt professed by these " pneumatics " or faithful of the Spirit, for their adversaries whom they designated as " psychics " or animals, an attitude not calculated to conciliate the hierarchy in their favour.

Controversies soon arose in which the credence to be given to these illuminati was sharply discussed, and episcopal synods were convoked for the purpose of examining these new doctrines. Some members of the Church went even too far in their anti-Montanist zeal. On the pretext of the support given to the new prophets by certain texts of St John, they were for rejecting the Apocalypse and even the gospel of St John. It was chiefly in Asia that the disputes took place, but the report of these controversies came also to Rome, where a presbyter called Caius attacked the innovators and profited by this occasion to criticise the writings of St John. This was hardly the way to restore peace, and by the end of the second century the general body of the Eastern hierarchy had taken up a definitely antagonistic position to Montanism. There were secessions and new local schisms, in which a pretence was made to safeguard the pure doctrine which the Church would not accept.

The Montanist communities, which were also called " Cataphrygian," or according to the fashion of the Phrygians, sought the support of the West, and especially of Rome. Here there was some hesitation about condemning them. If we are to believe Tertullian, one of the popes at the end of the second century (one cannot be certain which) was on the point of giving an official recognition to Montanism. The intervention of Praxeas finally altered this. Montanism in short took on more

and more the features of a heresy and schism, and became finally a small rigorist church which looked upon the Catholics as morally too relaxed, and reproached them with their real, or pretended, concessions to the spirit of the world. One can judge best of this movement by the writings of Tertullian, who towards the end of his life became a Montanist, and who heaped upon the "psychics" the most bitter imprecations which his harsh genius could devise.

The Novatians.—The spirit of Montanism is again to be found in the Novatian sect, which came into being immediately after the Decian persecution. This persecution led, as we have already seen, to numerous defections in the ranks of the faithful, defections more or less marked, ranging from apostasies in which some went over joyously and shamelessly to paganism, to minor backslidings, in which others without going so far as to sacrifice to the gods, stooped to buy the certificate (*libellus*) with which they were made immune from persecution.

For all these apostasies, for the crime of idolatry, real or assumed, the discipline of the Church was, as we have already seen, very severe. For some time it even excluded definitely from ecclesiastical reconciliation all those who, having been baptised, had been guilty of this crime. Definitely elaborated at an epoch when persecution was limited to smaller districts and had not assumed a character of special violence, this discipline, designed chiefly for smaller and carefully recruited communities, had not provided for mass defections such as took place during the persecution under Decius. Scarcely

had the persecution abated when immense crowds of *lapsi* (perverts) were to be seen in all the large cities in Rome, Carthage, and Alexandria, loudly demanding their reconciliation with the Church. Many no doubt did this in all humility, hoping by this attitude to disarm the hierarchy and to obtain, at a not distant date, a final reconciliation. Others claimed this reconciliation as a right, making use of threats and *libelli pacis* indulgence cards, which they had received from confessors suffering in prison, who, according to immemorial practice, had the right to claim indulgence for others in the name of their own sufferings, but who did not always use this privilege with discretion. At Carthage St Cyprian strove manfully to cope with these *lapsi*. In accord with the Church of Rome —represented at that time in the absence of the Pope by his presbyterium—he decided that, when peace was restored, an African council should at once settle the question definitely. In the meantime a promise was made to the *lapsi* that their case would be examined with good will, and that those who were in danger of death could even be reconciled to the Church. This latter concession was apparently made in defiance of the usual precedent.

Such comparative mildness did not cause a cessation of the troubles on this subject in Carthage. They were stirred up by a priest called Novatas whom Cyprian describes as having had deplorable antecedents. The bishop, strengthened by the support of the Roman Church, succeeded in spite of opposition in instituting the more moderate form of penitentiary discipline, which submitted the perverts to penance, but with the hope of a fairly

prompt reconciliation. Particular leniency was even shown when a new outburst of persecution threatened. The prudent measures of Cyprian, which soon became general in the Church, ought, it would seem, to have brought about peace.

This was not the case. By a strange paradox it came about that the party of Novatas which represented the *lapsi* of Carthage as in revolt against their lawful bishop raised at Rome a rigorist movement of which the head was a certain Novatian. He was at that time one of the most remarkable men of the community, endowed with profound learning, and gifted with the talents of an administrator. He had hoped one day to occupy the episcopal chair; but when the Roman Church, at the cessation of the Decian persecution, chose a head, it was Cornelius who was elected. Embittered by disappointment, Novatian did not hesitate in declaring a schism. He was encouraged to this step by Novat, who, having gone to Rome to agitate for the election of a Pope who would oppose Cyprian, was also displeased at the nomination of Cornelius. All ways and means being acceptable to this intriguing Carthaginian priest, he joined Novatian, although this latter represented, from the moral point of view, a standard directly opposed to his own. The schism once declared, the church of Novatas and Novatian had to draw up a programme, if only to justify its secession. As Cornelius had deliberately adopted a policy of clemency, and showed himself ready to pardon the *lapsi* on easy terms, and as the men whom Novatian had gathered round him were mostly intransigent confessors, outraged at seeing a mass of defaulters reconciled to the Church, it was

thought best in the Novatian chapel to adopt an absolutely rigorous attitude in this matter of reconciliation. Under pretext of returning to the older penitential discipline, the Novatians went so far as to refuse to all *lapsi* any hope of pardon. They even went further, and tried to pretend that the Church had not the power to remit mortal sin, and that in consequence any community, which even after suitable penance, received the sinner back into its midst, was contaminating itself by this fact, defiling its mysteries by the presence of such undesirable persons; and that such communities ceased thereby to be the virginal spouses of Christ. Only the Novatian Church, thanks to its austere intransigence, remained the holy assembly, the reunion of the pure (*catharoi*). All this was formulated and propagated in a comparatively short time. Some bishops were partly gained to the cause in the West as well as in the East, and these, without breaking with the great Church, yet encouraged the Novatian tendencies. Wherever the bishops ranged themselves on the side of the more merciful attitude adopted by the Churches of Rome and Carthage, dissenting chapels sprang up. In this way the Novatian schism continued right through the third century. In the East Novatianism entered into alliance with the Montanist communities and thus assured to itself in the districts adjoining Phrygia a duration which could not be explained but for this circumstance.

Dispute concerning the Baptism of Heretics.—We have seen that, in proportion as the Church grew and spread, side branches detached themselves, which still holding some of the original sap,

maintained for a time the appearance of life. At the period which we are describing there existed over against the Catholic Church, Valentinian, Marcionite, Montanist, and Novatian communities, to speak only of the more important of these groups. The co-existence of the greater Church and of these groups created a new problem and one which in itself very nearly led to schism.

If on the one hand the different sects found recruits among the deserters from the Catholic Church, on the other hand adepts of these sects wished sometimes to return to the Mother Church. For those who had been baptised in this latter the difficulties were not so great. They were, like other penitents, reconciled by the imposition of hands, and it appears that pardon was granted them without too serious difficulty. The case was quite different for those who had received baptism in any of the existing sects. Could this initiation be valid, administered as it had been, by a Christianity that was spurious? Were the adepts of the different sects to be treated as simple penitents when they presented themselves to the Catholic Church, or were they on the contrary obliged to pass again through the rites of Christian initiation? Opinions differed; but strange to say, the two opposed solutions both laid stress on the same axiom: "There is, there can be, but one baptism" (*Confiteor unum baptisma*).

In Africa, in the Asiatic provinces, and in Syria, the axiom was interpreted in the sense that the only valid baptism was that administered in the Catholic Church, and that the rite of initiation of heretics was invalid. It was then necessary to impose upon those converted all the ceremonies which were usual

among the orthodox. This usage was based upon a tradition which was said, perhaps without sufficient proof, to go back to the earliest ages, and was also based upon the assumption that the Catholic Church, alone possessing the Holy Spirit, alone could confer this Spirit in baptism. In any case, whether first in the East, or in Africa, uniformity of usage had been established. An African council held under the bishop Agrippinus about A.D. 220, and synods held about the same time in Iconium and Synnada, assured uniformity of practice. A sufficiently specious reasoning sustained the tradition, which had already been supported by Tertullian: baptism was given to us Catholics, heretics having no part with us do not share this gift. Catholics and heretics have nothing in common, not the same God, nor the same Christ, and in consequence not the same baptism; when we receive converts into the Church we do not renew, we give them for the first time an initiation they have never received.

In Rome and in Egypt the Catholics reasoned and acted differently. They considered that the baptism received in the heretical sects was valid, without troubling much about the conditions under which it had been administered nor about the baptismal confession of faith which had preceded it. They were content to impose hands upon the converts, which was a rite of penance as well as one part of the consignment. This usage was supported by ancient tradition. It was based upon the argument that the sacramental rite has, independently of the minister who administers it, a value in itself. This value was not clearly defined. It was also not made clear whether the dispositions of the candidate played a rôle in the assignment by God of those

special gifts which constituted the *raison d'être* of the sacrament. If the principle from which the Church in these regions started was excellent, there can be no doubt that it would have been better to have secured this principle by certain distinctions which were made only later.

Be that as it may, the two usages co-existed peacefully during the first half of the third century. The difficulties first began in Africa in 234. Indecision, doubt as to the merit of the African practice, began to make themselves felt, excited probably by a propaganda in favour of the Roman attitude in this question, perhaps even by some document more or less official emanating from Rome, in which stress was laid upon the respect due to the see of Peter. Up to that time the relations between Cyprian and "the Church over the water" had been good. The bishop of Carthage had contributed in winning over from Novatian the confessors who had revolted against Pope Cornelius. He continued to be on friendly terms with Pope Lucius. But after the accession of Pope Stephen (254-257) a certain tension became apparent between the two sees. In truth the theories which Cyprian professed regarding the distribution of power in the Church made it practically impossible for him to appreciate at its real value the traditional authority of the Roman See. Recognising, or thinking to recognise in the African indecision an interference of Pope Stephen, Cyprian summoned his colleagues successively in the spring and autumn of 256 and made them define the doctrine looked upon by them as traditional, i.e. the nullity of baptism as administered by heretics. This decision he communicated to Pope Stephen in a letter in which he claimed for

each bishop the right to act as he thought best without having to render an account to anyone but to God. This was courting conflict. Pope Stephen, much offended, decided to bring matters to a climax. As Victor had formerly done at the time of the dispute about Easter, he addressed a letter to the different churches which prescribed that they should conform in the matter of baptism to the Roman usage, and threatened to break with those who would not recognise the validity of baptism by heretics. Cyprian was unfortunately not a man to go back on his word. A council called by him in September, 256, and of which the minutes are partially preserved, decided to hold to the African practice, and this not without making sufficiently transparent allusions to the pretended tyranny of the Roman Church. The order of Rome, if not disputed, was ignored, and at the same time alliances were sought in the East, where, at least so it appears from a letter of Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the measures taken by Pope Stephen had been regarded as extreme. Providence did not allow a schism to break out upon a question so full of misunderstanding and among those who in other ways had so truly served the Church. How the matter was cleared up cannot be ascertained because of the lack of documents, but we know that the most powerful bishop of the East, Denis of Alexandria, interposed and, as formerly Irenæus had done with Pope Victor, he advised Pope Stephen to act with more moderation. The latter died on the 2nd of August, A.D. 257. His successor, Sixtus II, acting on the advice of Denis, chose a more moderate policy, and amicable relations were re-established between Rome and Carthage, each

continuing for the time being to act according to its own traditional practice. The questions relating to the baptism of heretics were to be regulated only progressively in the course of the fourth century and by the introduction of distinctions which in the beginning had been overlooked. In the meantime the persecution of Valerian put an end to all personal questions. On the 6th of August, 258, Pope Sixtus died a martyr, and on the 11th of September Cyprian also gave his life for the Christian faith. Among all the great bishops of the early Church Cyprian's name alone is inserted together with those of the first popes in the canon of the Roman Mass.

CHAPTER V

THE FINAL CRISIS. THE GREAT PERSECUTION. THE PEACE OF CONSTANTINE

The Great Persecution—The Edict of Milan.

A CERTAIN number of contemporary documents show up in brilliant relief some moments in the history of the Church in the third century. Then suddenly the light fails and we are almost without any news of the last forty years of this century. It was the period when, as we have already seen, Christianity was establishing its position in the Empire, and forcing a way even beyond the frontiers of the Empire. It was penetrating into all ranks of society, and was no longer, as in the first, or even in the second century, a religion of the humble classes. At that time Christians of any considerable position were the exception, now, at least in the towns, Christians were to be met with, not only among the senatorial nobility, and among business men and lawyers, but also in the Imperial administration. There were many Christians in the army in spite of the prejudices entertained by some rigorists against the army as a profession. If we remember that in 249 the emperor, Philip the Arab, was a Christian, and that later the wife and daughter of

Diocletian were at least catechumens, we can realise more clearly how Christianity had gradually invaded every rank of Roman society. It looked as if a day might soon come when without any upheaval the Empire might declare itself Christian.

Contrary to all anticipation this result was to be attained only at the price of a terrible crisis, which, if it caused the Church immense suffering, hastened on the other hand the official triumph of Christianity, and created a definite break between the old order and the new.

The Great Persecution.—It was the emperor Diocletian who called up this storm. Devoted to the "Roman Cause," as is evidenced by the many important reforms effected by him in the administration of the Empire, he was a faithful adherent of the old conception of the religious mission of the State. This became evident as early as 296 in connexion with the question of Manichæism. At that date Manichean propaganda, spreading from Persia, began to cause anxiety to the Imperial government. Rigorous measures were taken against the heads of this sect and even against mere adherents. The clauses of the edict announced in formal terms the duty of the State in suppressing religious innovations, in upholding the gods of the republic, and the religion which honoured them. The Emperor hesitated to attack the Christian Church of Rome knowing it to be firmly anchored, and for a considerable time political scruples held his natural religious intransigence in check. It was only the influence of his Eastern colleague, Galerius, which finally decided the outbreak of the persecution. Galerius—at least according to Lactantius—was

filled with a fanatical hatred of Christianity. Diocletian did not at first desire to proceed to bloodshed, but once embarked upon a campaign of violence he found it impossible to draw back.

The first step, in A.D. 302, was the weeding out of the army, a prudent measure if one considers the power of the legions at that period, and the great number of Christians to be found in them, even in the higher grades. All soldiers were called upon to sacrifice to the gods under pain of expulsion, a grave penalty where military service was a profession. A large number of Christians left the army in consequence of this decree. In February, 303, Galerius forced Diocletian to issue a more general edict. Christian assemblies were to be forbidden, churches demolished, and the sacred books burned. All Christians were called upon under pain of civil degradation to worship the Roman deities. This latter order affected differently the different classes. In Nicomedia, the residence of Diocletian, the Church of the Christians was razed, and, on the pretext of political troubles, violence and bloodshed broke out in this town. In other parts of the Empire officials kept to the strict execution of the decree, at least with regard to the demolition and dismantling of churches, and the search for religious books. The articles relating to persons were not so strictly followed. Attempts at rebellion which soon broke out in Syria and Armenia offered a pretext for renewed severity. In the course of the year 303 an order was issued to arrest all members of the clergy, and to detain them in prison, as long as they refused to sacrifice. Soon those who refused were condemned to death. This was the beginning of a persecution to blood.

It was soon to extend to all Christians, for in the spring of 304 an edict appeared which envisaged all the faithful. Everyone, in every town, was called upon to offer public libations to the gods. In 250 travelling commissions had traversed the provinces in order to ensure the execution of a like order, but we do not know how the inquisition of 304 was organised. Some indications seem to show that in many places the idols were placed at the entrance of the towns and markets, and the passers-by were expected to perform before them some religious rite, under the surveillance of the police. This precaution would naturally lead to the discovery of many Christians. The fact that there was no common plan of pursuit and repression imposed throughout the Empire explains how the effects of the legislation which went out from Nicomedia were very different in different parts of the tetrarchy. In the states under Constantius Chlorus (Britain, Gaul and Spain) the authorities showed clemency, and if there were some executions, they were the exception. But in the rest of the Empire the persecution raged with violence in spite of the many changes of rulers which modified the tetrarchy between 305 and 308. The scenes which had marked the persecution of Decius were renewed. Many martyrs, confessors, fugitives, and alas! many renegades. Contemporary testimony, which is precise, leaves no doubt as to the great number of martyrs made by this persecution, nor as to the special atrocity of the torments invented for the purpose of winning the Christians to apostasy, or of punishing them for their obstinacy. It is true nevertheless that from 307 on, penal servitude (*metalla*) usually replaced the penalty of death, but

this spelt greater suffering for the condemned. The quarries of Egypt, the copper mines of Phæno, south of the Dead Sea, became the scenes of horrible atrocities. For many a long year these dreadful names figured in the annals of the martyrs.

It was the East especially which, under the rule of Galerius and Maximin Daza, knew the worst terrors of the persecution. Here it lasted for seven years. In the West where, as we have seen, certain countries remained almost immune, the Christians began after 307 to breathe again. The two emperors, Constantine and Licinius, and the usurper Maxentius who ruled in Rome, showed their subjects, if for very different reasons, a good deal of tolerance. In 388 the news spread suddenly that Galerius, and with him Maximin Daza, had officially accorded the Christians the right to live. In his last agony Galerius had even recommended himself to the prayers of those whom he had so cruelly persecuted. Did this suggest definite peace? It might have inspired such a hope, the more so as after the death of Galerius, Maximin Daza, whose fanaticism was at least equal to that of Galerius, gave to the pretorian prefect a verbal order to cease from persecuting the Christians. But the spirit of persecution soon gained the upper hand again with this ruler of the East. Vexations, injustices, violences, even executions, caused the Christians of the East to feel the hardness of their position, which contrasted painfully with that of their brethren in the West.

The Edict of Milan.—In the West there was general rejoicing. Constantine, the sovereign of Gaul, had succeeded in ridding himself in the battle

of the Milvian Bridge of the usurper Maxentius. He attributed the happy issue of this battle to the help of the God of the Christians (October, 312). Welcomed in Rome as a liberator, he met some weeks later his colleague Licinius, sovereign of Illyricum. The two emperors of the West agreed to take measures to restore tranquillity to the Roman world, and especially to maintain religious peace. They wished to constrain Maximin Daza also to practise this policy of tolerance, and in offering opposition to this policy the emperor of the East was soon to lose his crown and his life. In August, 313, the Empire had only two rulers, Constantine in the West, and Licinius in the East. Both decided, if for very different reasons, to put in practice the stipulations of the *Edict of Milan*.

This name is given to the edict which finally put an end to the uncertain position which Christianity had held for two and a half centuries. Although the exact text of the official document is disputed, it is easy to recognise the spirit in which it was drawn up. The underlying principles deserve closer consideration. A former edict issued in 311, and which bears the name of Galerius, Constantine, and Licinius, recognised the existence of Christians, but it did so only by compulsion, and on account of the impossibility of imposing the ancient customs (*mos majorum*) upon these same Christians. It was political necessity which forced the rulers to break with the old Roman principle of State religion. In the Edict of Milan in 313, on the contrary, a new principle emerges—care for the public welfare, and a feeling of respect for the Divinity, which demands that every religious opinion

should be allowed to develop. This edict assured, from that time forward, liberty of conscience to all, Christians as well as members of other religions. "It is accorded to each one to follow the observances of his religious cult; as is necessary to the tranquillity of our times." This edict offered at the same time to those who had been persecuted, the right to claim damages for the losses caused by the persecution. The goods belonging to Christian communities, whether places of worship (churches, cemeteries) or property not destined for religious use, were to be restored. Those buildings, etc., which had been transferred were, by virtue of this law, and without any legal action, to be given up by their actual tenants, who should, however, possess the right to claim indemnity from the Imperial treasury.

The special character of this edict deserves notice. Emanating from two princes, of whom one was and would remain pagan, while the other, Constantine, was not yet a Christian, this edict was founded on common justice and simple tolerance; a unique conception in the religious history of antiquity. Let us add that this tolerance did not rest upon a principle of indifference on the part of the State with regard to religious matters, but rather upon the idea that all religious cult was a homage paid to the Deity. This Deity, so recognised, was certainly not the personal God of revelation, or of the gospels, but rather an abstract divinity such as the cultured minds of the time acknowledged. This *numen divinum*, this *divinitas*, or supreme deity, of which the texts of the period speak, was, at the time of the Edict of Milan, admitted by Licinius even while he retained all the pagan rites.

It was also the last conclusion to which the mind of Constantine had, at that moment, arrived, although he had definitely turned away from paganism. It would be premature to speak in 313 of the conversion of Constantine, but his complete adhesion to Christianity was already prepared. For the time being his effort towards peace was, if to some extent the performance of a religious duty, yet primarily a wise political measure, which certainly did not fail to bear good fruit.

After such extraordinary changes and violent overturnings religious peace could not be established in a day. It is true that, after the disappearance of Maximin Daza, there was a short period when the whole Church, in the East as in the West, enjoyed the triumph of renewal. This moment passed quickly because the tolerance of the ruler of the East, Licinius, weakened by degrees. His attitude towards the Christians grew unfavourable, and at last, exasperated by political misgivings, he turned to a policy of persecution; thinking that his Christian subjects, envying the privileges of their brethren in the West, longed secretly for Constantine, who for his part hardly disguised his desire to see the Empire united under one head, Licinius began to harass the Christians with the same vexatious measures that Maximin Daza had tried even after the Edict of Milan. Police restrictions interfered with the liberty of Christian assemblies; it was thought necessary once more to purge the army and administration of Christians. Matters went from bad to worse, and scenes of persecution such as were thought to have disappeared for ever, were once more witnessed. Churches were demolished, ecclesiastics were condemned to the mines, and executions

took place under various pretexts, in which, of course, politics played a part.

All this tended to envenom the relations between the two emperors, which since 314 had been frankly unfriendly. For military reasons war was resumed in 323. Defeated in Thrace and in Bythnia, Licinius was soon compelled to beg mercy at Constantine's hands. His life was temporarily spared, but he was executed later, at Thessalonica, in spite of solemn promises made to the contrary. Constantine remained sole emperor, and the peace of Constantine now extended to the whole Roman Empire.

PART II

THE CHURCH AND THE CHRISTIAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER I

CHRISTIANITY AS THE RELIGION OF THE STATE

Constantine—The sons of Constantine—Julian the Apostate—Valentinian and Valens—Gratian and Theodosius.

The Edict of Milan, with the official tolerance which it accorded to all religious forms, represents as we have said a unique conjunction in the history of antiquity. For a moment the Roman State abandoned the old conception by which Rome had made it its duty to organise divine worship, without leaving any option either as regards the external form of religion, or the vital conceptions which underlay these forms. But this moment was short. Rapidly the old habits of thought and action gained once more the upper hand and State religion imposed itself again and with more authority than ever; but this time, the religion was Christianity—Catholicism. Certainly it was not in one day that this change of rôles was accomplished; but already immediately after the Edict of Milan we can trace the beginnings of the tendency which, in less than twenty years, made Christianity the privileged religion, even before it became the exclusive religion—the religion of the Emperor and of the State. This tendency first showed itself in the good dispositions of the ruling

authorities towards the Catholic Church, and in the hostility, more or less expressed, with which they surrounded both the schismatics and the champions of the old religion. The Church at first did not think of taking umbrage at this line of conduct which was favourable to her interests. Her anxiety was scarcely aroused by an even more surprising phenomenon, namely the interference of the civil authorities in matters pertaining to a domain that was apparently outside their jurisdiction. Inspired by a noble desire of helping the Church to maintain a uniformity of belief, this interference on the part of the emperors was bound to raise grave difficulties. A day was to come, and quickly, when the emperors, priding themselves upon their theology, would interfere without discretion in matters of faith and morals. Examples of this usurpation of power, sometimes disguised, sometimes flagrant, will be met with more and more frequently in the period which we are about to study. They were, let us not fear to say it, the dearly paid price for the protection with which the Church was surrounded. We must first show the evolution of this régime of protection, leaving to later chapters the narrative of the doctrinal and disciplinary controversies to which it led.

Constantine.—Starting from a vague philosophic monotheism, Constantine, after the Edict of Milan, moved rapidly to a more and more firmly established adherence to Christianity. This adherence was, however, purely intellectual, and was to develop only much later in the sense of genuine conversion. Inscribed as a catechumen at an advanced age, Constantine was to be baptised only on his death-

bed, and by an Arian bishop. But, however limited, the attachment of the Emperor to the Christian religion soon dictated with regard to this latter, as also with regard to the other forms of worship, an attitude which differed considerably from that expressed by the Edict of Milan. And this new attitude became accentuated after the disappearance of Licinius. Let us first draw attention to the growing favour with which the Emperor regarded Christianity. It manifested itself from the beginning in the large donations made to the churches which had been destroyed during the persecution. Such gifts formed, after all, no part of the terms of the peace edict. At a very early date one ecclesiastic, who was to play later a considerable rôle, Hosius, bishop of Cordova, became one of the counsellors of the Emperor, distributor of Imperial bounties and inspirer of many measures which were adopted. The patrimony of the Church was not only restored, but riches of every kind were added. Ancient buildings were made over to Christians, for instance the Lateran palace which had belonged to Fausta, the wife of Constantine. Thanks to the Imperial munificence, the construction of the great basilicas began. The Lateran, the Vatican basilica, which was par excellence the basilica of Constantine, the church of St Agnes on the Numetian Way, St Paul Without the Walls, and St Lawrence. A little later St Helen, the Emperor's mother, constructed in the palace of the Sissoriani a basilica intended to recall the holy places of Palestine (Holy Cross of Jerusalem). After the triumph over Licinius, the piety of the dowager empress and her son delighted in venerating in the Holy Land the places rendered famous by events of the Old Testament or of the

Gospel story. The work was first begun in Jerusalem, where the basilica of the Anastasis (Resurrection) was built so as to enclose the scene of the Crucifixion and the Holy Sepulchre. The dedication was celebrated with solemnity on the 14th of September, 327. Somewhat later St Helena ordered the construction of a sanctuary at Bethlehem and of the church of the Mount of Olives. Antioch and Nicomedia were also given magnificent churches, the Emperor contributing to the construction. But it was chiefly in his own city that Constantine gave full rein to his passion for erecting religious and civil buildings. Abandoning Rome, as too much peopled by pagan memories, the Emperor did not hide his intention of making his new residence a city completely up to date and completely Christian, a fitting capital for the new Empire, a second Rome, which in his thought was destined to eclipse the old. The dedication was celebrated on the 11th May, 330.

Munificent gifts to the Church on the part of the Emperor were not the only indications of Imperial favour; legislative measures were taken directly to benefit the Catholic clergy. The most appreciated was that which exempted clerics from the more onerous public duties, among them that of curiale which was justly dreaded. It was soon found necessary, however, to modify this exemption which threatened to deprive the municipalities of the co-operation of many wealthy citizens. In any case such exemption of the clergy was not foreign to Roman common law. Exemption from municipal charges had been accorded not only to the pagan priesthood, but also to members of professions considered useful to the city. The same might be said

of the right now accorded to Christians of leaving money to churches; this merely placed the Christian churches on an equality with the pagan temples which had always had the right to receive legacies. Other measures aimed at bringing the Roman code more into harmony with the Christian outlook; such were the abolition of the penalty of crucifixion, and of *crurifragium* or the breaking of bones, the prohibition to mark the faces of the condemned "made in the likeness of divine beauty," the abolition of the laws made by Augustus against celibacy, the facilities granted for the liberating of slaves, of which the ceremony was allowed to take place in the church and in the presence of the bishop.

It must be added that these favours did not extend to all Christians. There existed at that time besides the Catholic Church a number of dissenting communities, Marcionites, Montanists, Novatians, even a certain number of Gnostic lodges. Their existence shocked from the very first Constantine's desire for unity and symmetry, for the monarchic system as applied to spiritual as well as temporal matters. These sects were temporarily tolerated according to the Edict of Milan, but this scornful tolerance deliberately excluded them from the favours shown to Catholics. With regard to the heresies which tended to develop in Constantine's reign we shall soon see how the Emperor's policy tried in every way to forestall, to impede, to restrain and reduce them, even by force when persuasion failed.

It is easy to see that in his attitude towards paganism the Emperor departed more and more from the spirit of toleration which marked the Edict of Milan. This new and slightly hostile attitude

was restrained during the lifetime of Licinius. It is certain that Constantine, although he retained to the end of his life the title of Pontifex Maximus, never after 312 took any part in any formal acts of pagan worship, yet the ceremonies of pagan cult still existed as an integral part of the official life of Rome; and there could of course be no question of putting obstacles in the way of the old religion. The laws passed in 319 and in 321 concerning magic, and the abuse of aruspicy or the art of divination, are of the same nature as others passed by emperors genuinely pagan in sentiment. Once his colleague Licinius was got rid of, the sovereign felt at more liberty to express his true sentiments with regard to the old rites. From that time he did not hide his contempt for them, and it was soon felt, especially in the East where he had made his residence, that Imperial favours would no more be given to officials who clung to the old religion. This fact accounts perhaps for the number of conversions which took place at this time in the higher classes of society. In Rome, the forsaken capital, the old pagan spirit survived much longer among the nobility, in particular among the Senate.

We must not however believe, as certain Christian texts of the period affirm, that Constantine had declared war on paganism, on the temples and sacrifices. Some of the temples were doubtless stripped of their riches for the embellishment of Constantinople, but this was the caprice of an autocrat with a mania for building and of an all too powerful amateur. Some temples were closed for scandals which fell under the jurisdiction of the police. Some were demolished, often at the request of a municipality, which, entirely Christian, had no

further use for them, but in general we can say that the letter if not the spirit of the Edict of Milan was respected by Constantine.

The Sons of Constantine.—In the measure that paganism began to crumble under the mass conversions to Christianity, so the liberty of worship proclaimed by the Edict of Milan became more and more restricted. This was particularly the case during the reign of Constantine's sons 337-361. Successive laws forbade, first the public practice of paganism, and later even the secret practice of pagan rites. A law in 341 passed by Constantius and Constans forbade sacrifice to the gods, under penalties which are not exactly stated. This law was reinforced in 353 by another dictated by Constantius, who from this time was sole ruler of the Empire, a law of persecution since it prescribed the closing of temples and forbade pagan sacrifices under pain of death and loss of property. The same prohibitions are to be found in a law which was promulgated in 356 and—let it be remarked—under the names of Constantius and Cæsar Julian. It is worth noting, however, that the only act of pagan worship which was rigorously prescribed was that of sacrifice. A good deal of the exterior pomp connected with the ancient religion and with the institutions which provided for it, continued to subsist. Another fact, not less characteristic of the growing disfavour into which paganism had fallen, was the removal of the statue of Victory which had presided over the meetings of the Senate. Constantius on his first visit to Rome in April, 357, did not wish, it is said, to enter the hall of assembly until the statue and the altar, upon

which the senators were wont to cast some grains of incense in passing, had been removed.

The anti-pagan legislation was not, however, applied with the rigour which might be supposed from some of the texts. Let us remark that there were no pagan martyrs, regularly condemned by the authorities, but there may have been here and there violence and bloodshed owing to riots which claimed victims on both sides. Even as late as the beginning of the fifth century scenes of savagery directed by certain fanatical groups against pagans in Alexandria are recorded. As regards the laws against temples they were applied in those places where pagans were in the minority. In such places the temples were often pulled down and the materials so gained used in the construction of Christian churches; sometimes, but rarely, the Christians installed themselves in the abandoned sanctuaries. In the towns, on the other hand, where paganism predominated, the laws against the temples were not enforced, at least not more than the laws against persons were in any part of the Empire. How else, but by a deliberate ignoring of the law, is it to be explained that in Rome in 359 the urban prefect was a pagan who, according to Ammius Marcellinus, dared to sacrifice publicly to the gods?

The religious policy of Constantius, if it accelerated the fall of paganism in those parts where the old religion was on the decline, did not succeed in touching it in other places where it was still predominant. It is also doubtful which form of Christianity the Emperor wished to impose. It was certainly not, as we shall see later, orthodox Catholicism, which was rarely persecuted with more perseverance than during his reign. Constantius,

as soon as he was sole ruler of the Empire, did not refrain from the worst forms of violence to ensure the triumph of the counterfeit Christianity of which he had elaborated the formula. Witnessing the scenes which dishonoured the churches of Alexandria in 256-257 the pagans exclaimed, "Constantius has become a pagan and the Arians have returned to our mysteries." This was inexact, but in the person of Constans' successor this pious exclamation was to be verified. Julian reverted to paganism and once more the Roman Emperor recognised the mysteries of the old religion.

Julian the Apostate.—If we are to understand something of the character of this man, in whom the old spirit of paganism returned to Rome, we must say a few words about the anterior life of Cæsar Julian, known through ecclesiastical historians as Julian the Apostate. Nephew of Constantine and cousin german to Constans and Constantius, Julian was born in 331 and belonged to a Christian family. In 337 he escaped with his half-brother Gallius from a massacre of all the other members of his family, a massacre for which the sons of Constantine seem to have been responsible. Treated by his cousin Constantius as dangerous relatives, he and Gallius were relegated to a distant castle in Cappadocia. In 351 Constantius, the only surviving son of Constantine, having no son and being anxious to continue the dynasty in his family, promoted Gallius to the rank of Cæsar and confided to him the government of the East; but in 354 Constantius had already got rid of this colleague. During these three years from 351 to 354 Julian, being held in less close captivity, visited

Constantinople, Nicomedia and Athens. In his travels he came into contact with Hellenic culture, which up to that time had been kept from him. In 335 he was called to the court of Milan and became associated in the government. The manner in which Julian, who was then only twenty-four, acquitted himself in the government of Gaul, gave promise of a future glorious reign. Called upon in 360 to lead his troops into the East, he prepared to obey this order of Constantius, but on his arrival in Paris his troops proclaimed him emperor. This meant war with his cousin. In the course of the year 361 the two adversaries prepared to march against one another, but Constantius died a happy death on the 3rd of November at the foot of Mount Taurus. Julian remained sole emperor, and on the 11th of December he made his triumphal entry into the city of Constantine—"the rival of the apostles."

Julian had left Gaul a Christian, at least in name; he arrived in the city of Constantine a professed pagan. This was probably the climax of a long interior evolution, which led him from Christian belief to a paganism that was devout, even fanatical. Disgusted with the disputes which for twenty-five years had torn the Christian body, drawn to Hellenism, seduced by the Neo-Platonic philosophy which gave to the pagan myths the semblance of rational explanation, everything tended to draw him from the cold, dry, controversial form of Christianity in which he had been brought up and to win him to a peculiar form of paganism. This religion which Julian had evolved for himself as early as 359—although he continued for ten years afterwards to practise the external rites of Christianity—was certainly not the official paganism

of ancient Rome, neither was it, unless in the opinion of Julian himself, a return to classic Hellenism, but rather a kind of Neo-Platonic syncretism of which the chief feature was the worship of the sun-god, the incarnation and symbol of the forces of nature. Julian retained especially the mysticism of Neo-Platonism—the desire to enter into intimate and personal contact with the Deity, and he believed that he several times experienced this ecstatic communion. Such were the thoughts that Julian disguised even as late as January, 361, but which he suddenly revealed during his rapid march through Illyricum, where he ordered the temples along his route to be reopened, he himself—according to Libanius—offering sacrifice. The Roman Emperor had reverted to paganism.

The religion of Julian became the religion of the State. But it was essential to lend this religion some vitality, and to this end it would be necessary to breathe new life into the moribund paganism which still survived. In the midst of the anxieties of State by which he was harassed Julian did not lose sight of the project to which he felt himself called from on high. This project was the reform of the old religion. Unconsciously, and by a strange phenomenon of imitation, we see him renewing the old religion on the model of the Christian Church, exerting himself to give it a dogma, a moral code, a priesthood, a hierarchy. He even demanded of the pagan priests to become apostles and preachers, a thing of which they had never dreamed, and imposed upon them a still more extraordinary burden, that of becoming men of prayer and of interior life. He also incited them to works of charity and assistance, such as had been

preached by the Christians. The success of this enterprise was but mediocre, and to tell the truth, the old sacerdotal colleges must have been much surprised by the exigencies of the Emperor.

To revitalise paganism and give it back its place as official religion, to reopen the temples and renew the sacrifices, would not be sufficient unless at the same time Christianity could be weakened. To attain this end Julian worked actively, not wishing, it is true, a bloody persecution, but doing at the same time his utmost to injure the Galileans. Once more the army and administration were purged of Christians, the immunities formerly granted to clerics were withdrawn. An order was given to the Christians to restore the pagan temples which they had taken and to reconstruct those they had destroyed. The reaction growing more violent, certain rights, which belonged to all, were withdrawn from Christians. Education had been up to that time perfectly free in the Empire, the State hardly occupying itself with this department of public life. Julian was the first to pass laws in this matter which deprived the Christian schoolmasters of the right to teach grammar and rhetoric by the use of the pagan classics. This was a grave prohibition at a time when culture was imparted entirely through the medium of the ancient classics, when Homer was the book from which Greek was learnt, and Virgil the class-book for Latin. Julian, it is true, did not forbid Christian scholars from attending the pagan schools, but such an attendance often appeared suspicious in the eyes of Christian families, and, practised in the measure intended by Julian, would certainly have led to disastrous consequences. The Emperor recoiled from open

persecution, but it was inevitable that the measures taken and the appeals made to the pagan sentiment of the masses should lead to scenes of violence. There were some executions caused by the too vehement protestations of certain Christians, and there were popular tumults in which Christians perished. The story of Mark, bishop of Arethusa, who had once, in 337, saved Julian from being massacred, and who was himself later exposed to the fury of a mob that had been incited to fanaticism, is a well-known example of what Christians had sometimes to suffer. In Egypt and in Syria Christian priests and virgins were put to death with horrible refinements of cruelty. It is difficult to say what might have been the results of such a régime if it had been prolonged. As it was, there were many cases of sorry compromise among military and civil officials, while there were also examples of heroic resistance. Fortunately the storm lasted only eighteen months. On the 24th of June, 363, Julian was mortally wounded during a disastrous campaign and died the same night. "The Galilean had conquered."

Valentinian and Valens.—With Julian the last chance of a pagan renascence disappeared. The army, disorganised by the death of Julian, elected Jovian as his successor. He was a Christian and hastened to assume in religious matters a policy in every way opposed to that of his predecessor, but promising at the same time, it would appear, full liberty of conscience and worship to pagans. Jovian reigned only eight months and was replaced by Valentinian I (364-375), another candidate of the legions who, retaining for himself the government

of the West, appointed as ruler of the East his brother Valens (364-378). These brothers were Christians, but of very different colour. Valentinian, who was fundamentally orthodox, had yet no idea of imposing by force the faith he professed, and abstained from every measure which might seem to outrage the liberty of conscience proclaimed anew by Jovian. He avoided taking any active part in the disputes between pagans and Christians, and still more in those between the different confessions which acknowledged Christ. With Valens it was quite different. Devoted to the Arian cause, which Constantius had supported before him, he tried by every means to impose upon Catholics the official creed of Rimini. In his strange efforts to proselytise he often overlooked the pagans and even made allies of them in his struggle against orthodox Christianity. We shall come back to these facts when studying the Arian crisis, but it is to be remarked that paganism profited by these furious dissensions among Christians.

Gratian and Theodosius.—The days of paganism were, however, counted. The first serious attacks against it were made in the West by Gratian, the son of Valentinian (373-383). From the time of his accession he refused to accept the insignia of the *pontifex maximus* which his predecessors had received up to that time. In 382 he caused to disappear from the senate the statue of Victory which had been removed by Constantius but reinstated shortly afterwards. These decisions indicated clearly his point of view. The same year a legislative measure was passed which suppressed all the immunities, exceptions and benefices of the

pagan clergy and which gave to the treasury the lands possessed by the temples, and considerably restrained their right to receive legacies and donations. The immemorial link which had united the Empire and the traditional religion was broken. This latter continued, however, to live, and had not yet lost all prestige in the eyes of the upper classes.

Theodosius (379-395) was to give the old religion its death-blow. He commenced his reign by assuring the triumph of Nicene orthodoxy first over Arianism and then over the other sects. A series of laws, succeeding each other from 391 to 394, made life very hard for Nonconformists, and exacted from all Christians the formal acceptance of Catholicity in its most orthodox form. The pagans suffered still more from the disfavour of Theodosius. A law of 381, added to in 385, forbade all sacrifice with a view to foretelling the future, but the temples were still open. They were closed by a law of 391, which forbade, under pain of heavy fine, the practices of pagan worship even in the family and in private. These laws did not remain dead letters, and the closing of the temples led in different towns, as in Alexandria, to violent incidents. Paganism had certainly received its death-blow. After the short pagan reaction which followed in Rome the usurpation of Eugenius (392-394) Theodosius, being from that time recognised as ruler of the entire Empire, obtained from the senate a vote finally to abolish paganism from Rome. A symbolic action but one of little import. It signified merely that henceforth the old Roman aristocracy, the last refuge of pagan traditions, recognised the impossibility of fighting against the

new religion. This aristocracy remained pagan long after the decrees made by Theodosius and his successors, but these pagans, with the exception of a few isolated instances, were people with little influence. A day would soon come when the old religion would be found only in the most retired parts of the country and when paganism would be nothing but a peasant superstition (*paganus* = countryman, then pagan).

CHAPTER II

THE ROMAN STATE AND THE RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

The Donatist Schism—The Trinitarian Conflict in the Second Half of the Third Century—Arius and the Council of Nicæa—The anti-Nicene Movement—The Restoration of Orthodoxy.

THE first centuries of the Church's history were marked by keen religious controversy, but these disputes at least remained purely ecclesiastical affairs. Once peace had been established, disputes recommenced and schisms were engendered by questions appertaining to persons and doctrinal secessions which touched fundamental dogmas. There is no reason to be astonished at heresy, for "it must be that scandals come." But it is to be remarked that from the fourth century the controversies showed special virulence, and led to irremediable quarrels and feuds which could never be healed. This was because political interests began to intermingle with problems which were already in themselves complex. The interference of the civil authorities in matters beyond their competence produced almost as much evil as the brutal prohibitions of the first three centuries.

The fourth century was to witness two great

religious disputes. The one, which had its home in Africa, led to the founding of a schismatical church which was to hold in suspense for over a century the fate of the Catholic Church. This was the Donatist controversy. The other was of even wider extent, spreading over the whole Empire and causing incalculable trouble. This was the Arian controversy. If it did not lead, for the moment, to the founding of a separate church, it weighed none the less heavily upon the destiny of the Christian religion. The greater number of the barbarian races which were to destroy the Western Empire in the fifth century, would first know Christianity under the homoiousian form (Arianism) officially imposed during some twenty years by the emperors Constantius and Valens.

The Donatist Schism.—As Novatianism was one of the fruits of the Decian persecution so Donatism was a consequence of the "Great Persecution." It took its rise in Carthage, just as it was from this town that the movement went out in 251 which separated Novatian from the Church. As soon as the Western crisis came to an end in 306 a smothered disaffection made itself felt in Carthage. It was directed against the bishop Mensurius, and especially against his archdeacon Cæcilian. The attitude of the bishop during the persecution had been more than prudent, nevertheless this attitude was judged unfavourably in rigorous and enthusiastic circles. Cæcilian, on the other hand, was disliked because of the harshness of his administration. In short, when at the death of Mensurius in 311, the archdeacon was elected his successor, the election, though perfectly regular, was disputed by a group

of malcontents, among whom figured several confessors of the faith. Round this opposition some bishops of Numidia rallied, among others Donatus, bishop of Casa Nigra. One fine day all the malcontents assembled in Carthage and without so much as summoning Cæcilian passed a resolution against him in due form. Not being able to incriminate his election, his ordination was called in question. The latter was declared invalid, having been conferred by Felix, bishop of Aptunga, who was declared guilty of having delivered up the Holy Scriptures to the officers of Diocletian; of having been a "traditor," or traitor, in the common parlance of the period, and as such, guilty of grave sin. Felix, according to the Numidian bishops, could not transmit the Holy Spirit which he himself no longer possessed. In the place of Cæcilian, declared deposed, one Majorinus was chosen as bishop, but he, dying in 315, was replaced by Donatus, probably the same Donatus of the Casa Nigra whose name we have already cited. It was he who organised, first at Carthage, and later in the rest of Africa, the schism which was to be known as "the party of Donatus" and to receive its name from him: Donatism.

We see at once the questions raised by this controversy. The first was a question of ecclesiastical law. Was it true that a bishop, or cleric, who was in a state of sin, could not confer valid sacraments? This was a problem closely connected with the validity of heretical baptism, and in which the Donatists did not fail to quote St Cyprian. The second question raised concerned actual happenings. Had Felix of Aptunga really delivered up the sacred Scriptures, and was the ordination of Cæcilian on

this account null and void? Upon these two questions the whole of Africa argued passionately for more than a hundred years. Neither question was insoluble, but personal antipathies mixed themselves up with the religious problem and a confusion resulted which could only be resolved by force.

In spite of the election of Majorinus the government continued to regard Cæcilian as the lawful bishop, and as this was the moment when the government was carrying out the reparations promised by the Edict of Milan, it was absolutely necessary that it should have dealings with the ecclesiastical authorities. It was to Cæcilian that the administration appealed, not only with regard to questions touching Carthage, but also with regard to those which concerned the whole of Africa. The party of Majorinus protested and tried to win over the Emperor to its objection to Cæcilian. Constantine did not hesitate to take the matter in hand. The requests of the party seemed moderate; it demanded that the case should be tried not by the Emperor but by the bishops of Gaul, which country, not having known persecution, might be expected to have an unbiassed opinion; while unfavourable reports were current about the attitude of the Roman bishops during the great crisis. The first Imperial decision was extremely wise; it referred the matter to the Pope Miltiades, but in order to conciliate the plaintiffs the Emperor ordered three of the bishops of Gaul, those of Cologne, Arles, and Autun, to go to Rome and discuss the question with the Pope. Let us not forget that this was in the autumn of 313, barely a year after the Edict of Milan. Does not Constantine's manner of acting suggest that he thought

to extend to the Christian Church his authority as Pontifex Maximus?

The Roman tribunal passed a sentence in favour of Cæcilian, but this decision was declared void by the party of Majorinus, which claimed from the Emperor a revision of the process. This was granted, and the Emperor called together at Arles a certain number of Gallican bishops. The question was decided in the same way as at Rome. More respectful than the Emperor of the traditional rights of the see of Peter, the council communicated the sentence to the Pope. This decision was not better accepted than the first by the party which now called itself Donatist. Some of its adherents, it is true, rallied round the lawful bishop, but the leaders remained obstinate. Then, and through the logical development of his preceding attitude, Constantine conceived the idea of settling the question for himself. As he wrote to the Vicar-General of Africa: "He would show to the one party as to the other, how they were to honour the Deity, because his duty as emperor was to tolerate no evil, to exterminate error, and to establish unity in religion and in lawful worship." These sentiments show Constantine well advanced on the road that leads to Cæsaro-papism (subjection of the Church to the head of the State).

Having thus constituted himself arbitrator in this matter, Constantine called Donatus and Cæcilian to Milan in 316. Judgment was delivered in November, and once more favourably to Cæcilian. Having thus settled the dispute the Emperor thought it his duty to impose penalties upon the schismatics, although such a measure had not been demanded by the Catholics either at Rome or at Arles. The

Donatists were deprived by law of their churches, and in the face of their resistance recourse was had to military force. There were scenes of disorder and bloodshed. Similar riots took place in different parts of Africa. Penalties such as banishment and confiscation of property were inflicted upon Donatists by the Roman tribunals. The strong hand of the law prevailed, but from that time on the quarrels between Catholics and Donatists frequently caused bloodshed. It is a thing to be remembered that between the "Church of the martyrs" (as the Donatists now styled themselves) and the Church of the "Traditores" no reconciliation was possible. War to the death, was the cry which for centuries poisoned the religious life of Africa. We shall have more to say on the subject of the Donatists later; it is enough to remark here that Constantine, at the end of four years, recalled the rigorous measures he had decreed: a rescript advising tolerance was addressed to the Vicar-General of Africa in 321. This tolerance made it possible for the schism to organise itself. It soon counted at least two hundred and seventy bishops and became aggressive against Catholicism. Having secured the help of a revolutionary party, the *circoncelliones*, it spread terror through the whole of Africa, and military troops had again to be employed to suppress the disorders. Constantine died without having brought his struggle with the Donatists to a successful issue.

The Trinitarian Conflict in the Second Half of the Third Century.—Constantine's religious policy brought not only confusion into the Trinitarian question, it also increased the Arian peril. This latter was connected with wide issues which extended

far beyond mere politics. In order to understand the origin, development, and intricacies of the Arian controversy, it will be necessary to go back to remote antecedents, and to take up the Trinitarian question where we last left it. After the condemnation of the adoptionism of Theodosius, and after the vote of exclusion passed against the Modalism of Praxeas, of Noëtus, and Sabellius, the Western Church had built up for itself, if not a complete system of theology, at least a terminology which safeguarded the traditional declarations. The Church had adopted the expressions of Tertullian, "divine substance" and "divine persons," the "substance" designating the profound being of the Divinity, the root from which springs the triple life of the three divine Persons. And if it was asked, "How can one speak of a one and only God, and yet name a Father, a Son, and a Holy Spirit?" the reply was, that the three persons are of one and the same substance (*unius substantiæ*), which was the same as to say consubstantial, a term which, as we shall see, was destined to play a great rôle in Church history. While this development was taking place in the West, the school of Alexandria was elaborating a complete theology concerning the relations of the divine Persons. Origen especially took up again and perfected the theories of the older apologists. With him as with them the production —generation—of the Word was made necessary by the fact of creation, but here Origen went further than his predecessors, asserting that as creation is necessary and from all eternity, so the Word is necessary and from eternity. According to Origen, the Word is engendered of the substance of the Father, and is consequently God, but as He is the

arch-type of created things, so in a certain sense He may be taken as belonging to the category of the created. Origen goes so far as to call the Word a creation (*poiéma*) and a creature (*ctisma*); very dangerous expressions, as the sequence of events proved. In this way a theology was built up in Alexandria which quickly spread through the cultivated circles of the East. It was destined nevertheless to clash in certain points with other conceptions, and these first differences form the prelude to the great conflict of the third century.

In Cyrene, where perhaps Sabellius had taken refuge after his repulse at Rome, a form of Modalism flourished, towards the years 250-260, which recalls the old Patri-passionist ideas. It is really to this theology, more subtle than that of a Noëtus or a Cleomenus, that history has given the name of "Sabellianism." This theology has a great regard for the use of the expression "person" as applied to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but the word person (*prosôpon*) is taken in its etymological sense: face—countenance (theatre mask); the divine Persons are no more than three aspects, the three successive "masks" under which the same Divinity presented itself; there is identity between them, and it might be said that the Son was consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father. The Sabellians were ready to say that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, but they attached to this word a meaning very different from that later defined. As a matter of fact in Sabellian circles the expression "the Son of God" was avoided when speaking of Jesus.

The bishop of Alexandria, Denis, who was a wise administrator as well as a capable theologian (he

had been a disciple of Origen), was much disquieted by the state of things. He understood better than another the incompatibility of Sabellianism with traditional doctrine. He expressed this opinion very clearly in several letters addressed to the bishops of Cyrene. It is even possible that in his defence of the distinction of the divine hypostases he went too far, leaning towards subordinationism, which is the stumbling-block of the theory. However that may be, he was denounced at Rome to Pope Denis. This latter, in reply, addressed to his namesake of Alexandria a letter in which he demanded an explanation; at the same time he exposed in a general encyclical, or epistle, the Catholic faith with regard to the dogma of the Trinity. He blamed those who by a too absolute distinction of the hypostases, came almost to speak of three Gods, taking umbrage especially at the use of the expression *poiéma* as qualifying the Son. Such a blasphemy, he argued, would not have been made if the doctrine that the Son is consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father, had only been firmly adhered to. To this Denis replied by a most respectful apology in which he called attention to the fact that his thought had been more or less misrepresented. Taking the question as a whole he was ready to retract and to give the Pope every satisfaction. Only on one point did he feel constrained to make some restrictions. It appeared, he said, that Rome wished to impose the term *homoousios* to characterise the relations of the Father and the Son; this word, which was employed by the Sabellians in an heretical sense, could not please him. To the doctrine underlying this word, as used by Pope Denis, he declared himself, however, ready

to subscribe wholeheartedly. This apology seems to have given satisfaction. We may therefore assume that, from this time on, Rome adopted officially the consubstantialist formula, making of it a test of orthodoxy and even going so far as to impose it. Alexandria accepted this point of view and became afterwards its staunch defender.

Almost at the same time this very expression was condemned by a synod in Antioch, as being touched with heresy. This assembly, which had first tried to unite in 264, was held in 268 in order to judge the bishop of this town, Paul of Samosata. There were many grievances against him, some of a political order, others moral and administrative, but it was not with these things that the council was primarily occupied. It was occupied especially in inquiring into the theology of Paul, which appeared to justify suspicion. What exactly did he teach? After the lapse of centuries it is hard to tell. He rejected the traditional teaching about the Trinity, but to disguise his thought he had recourse to subtleties which disconcerted the council, and which even to this day make it impossible for us to pass definite judgment. Of the two latest historians of Paul of Samosata, the one regards him as an "adoptionist," renewing the errors of Theodotus, the other rather connects him with Sabellianism. One thing remains certain, that Paul rejected the Trinity of Divine Persons, that he was condemned, and the formula *homoousios tô Patri*, consubstantial with the Father, by which he had expressed the relation between the Father and the Son, was also proscribed. Compromised by heretical use, this term appeared to the bishops of

the East, faithful disciples of Origen, as incompatible with the clear distinction between the divine Persons.

Towards the last years of the third century a new school of theology came into being in Antioch. It centred round a priest called Lucian. A learned critic, an exegete of value, Lucian was also occupied with theological questions. As far as we can know, he seems to have accentuated the subordinationism which was to be found more or less veiled in the teaching of the apologists and of Origen. If we are to believe his disciples (and it is exclusively through them that we know Lucian) this priest of Antioch recognised the personal pre-existence of Christ, in other words the Incarnation of the Word —nevertheless he affirmed that the Word Himself, a celestial being, anterior to all creatures and the architect of creation, was Himself a creature, produced in time by God, to be the instrument of subsequent creation. This was a radical simplification of the Trinitarian Question which had occupied the Christian Church for two centuries, a simplification which tended towards nothing less than the suppression of one of the given points of the question, and the most traditional, that of the divinity of Christ. Lucian had travelled far from the attitude of Origen, of Hippolytus, of Justin, and so many others, who had all held to this fundamental truth, and who all, even at the price of certain incoherences, had safeguarded its moral and religious value. We see here how a dry, cold intellectualism, which tried to demonstrate religious questions like geometrical theories, had succeeded to the enthusiasm, more or less coloured by mysticism, which first characterised the school of

Alexandria. With such purely intellectual solutions the Church could feel no sympathy.

For the moment the discrepancy between the teaching of Lucian and that of the Church was not perceived, and the system of Lucian made but little stir. It is even possible that he was in good faith when he took cover under orthodox formulæ. Then the great persecution came, which stopped his teaching and dispersed his disciples, but finally crowned their master. In 212, when the persecution was resumed under Maximin Daza, Lucian died a martyr. His martyrdom proved for his school a protection against possible difficulties and gave them a memory to honour and to defend. We shall soon see how his pupils, the "Collucianists" as they styled themselves, grouped together and took up again the teachings of their master.

The persecution was hardly over when the Arian crisis arose.

Arius and the Council of Nicæa.—This heresy originated in Alexandria about 320-322 with a priest called Arius. Austere in life, imposing in exterior, this priest had great influence in the religious circles of Alexandria. We do not know how the affair began, but one day the priest of Baucalis (this was the name of the parish which Arius directed) was called upon by the bishop of Alexandria to explain certain points of his teaching. He did it without equivocation.

What he presented as authentic Christianity was above all a philosophic doctrine, in which reasoning held the first place, and this rigid dialectic led Arius to announce the following doctrines with regard to God and Christ: "God is one, eternal and

unengendered; all other beings are His creatures; the Word (Logos), the first created, was like other creatures drawn from nothing, not from the divine substance; there was a time when he did not exist, and he was brought forth by an act of the divine free will. Himself a creature of God, the Logos is the creator of all other beings, and thus justifies the name of God which is given to him, though improperly. In view of his future merits (the Logos being capable of merit and demerit, and having chosen good by his own free will) God had adopted him as His Son; but this adoption did not confer any real participation in the divine nature. We cannot even say that he is like (*homoios*) the Father, for God can have no like. With regard to the Holy Spirit, he is the first creature of the Word. At the given time the Word became flesh, in the sense of uniting himself to a human body. He fulfilled in this body the functions which with us are proper to the soul. In this way our Lord Jesus Christ was formed."

Presented thus crudely the doctrine of Arius went much further than the most adventurous conceptions of Origen, or even of Lucian. It reduced traditional Christianity to a dry theism, somewhat analogous to the doctrine of a supreme God as elaborated by the pagan philosophers. If the Jesus whom Arianism presented to the homage of Christians was still the creator, he was surely not the redeemer. Such teaching led very far away from the gospel and from traditional belief. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, had certainly Christian feeling on his side when he denounced the teaching of Arius. A synod which brought together about a hundred Egyptian bishops condemned the

priest of Baucalis and with him two bishops, five priests, and six deacons. All these were deposed, and the judgment was communicated to the neighbouring churches, and doubtless also to Rome.

Those who were condemned protested against their sentence and looked for supporters. These they found among the former disciples of Lucian. The old traditions of his school were revived, the associations of the past and the teachings of the master to which Arius pretended to be faithful, were recalled. Among these "Collucianists" one man stands out, Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, who was destined to become the evil genius of the Church. He was much in favour with Constantia, the sister of Constantine, and wife of Licinius. Arius did not hesitate to join Eusebius, and partisans were recruited, especially in Bithynia and Palestine. Soon afterwards Alexandria heard with stupefaction that two synods had admitted Arius and his followers to the communion of the faithful, and had authorised them to resume their ecclesiastical functions. Arius, encouraged by this decision, ventured to return to Alexandria and endeavoured to spread his teachings even among the people. These events probably took place in the autumn of 324.

This was just the time when Constantine, having triumphed over Licinius, had extended his power over the whole Empire. His inherent love of order and symmetry was violently shocked when the echoes reached him of the conflict which was dividing the churches of the East. Was he actually asked to intervene? It is not impossible. However that may be, towards the end of 324 the bishop of Cordova, Hosius, landed in Alexandria

as the representative of the Emperor. He came to pacify the church of Alexandria, where several disputes besides that of Arius were causing disturbance. Some of these questions were settled, but the more important ones, including that of Arius, remained unsolved. On his return to Nicomedia, where the Emperor then was, Hosius insisted that a council should be convoked, and the bishop of Alexandria apparently added his entreaties to those of the Emperor's ecclesiastical adviser. This time it was not a question of a circumscribed assembly such as had often been called together in the Church, it was the representation of all Christendom that was called for.

Constantine favoured the idea; he invited all the bishops in the Empire to come in the summer of 325 to the little town of Nicæa, which was not far from Nicomedia. "I announce my will to you," he wrote, "which is that you should repair without delay to the said town. Each one of you, preoccupying himself with what is most grave, will hasten, avoiding all delay in order to assist personally at all the deliberations." The Imperial post carriages were put at the disposal of the bishops, thus facilitating their journey. Pope Sylvester was invited to the council, but, because of his great age, he was represented by two Roman priests.

At the date fixed, from two hundred and fifty to two hundred and eighty bishops had replied to the Imperial convocation. The provinces most largely represented were those of Egypt and the civil diocese of the Orient, and those of Anatolia. But there were also prelates from Illyricum (Balkans). The Latins were not numerous, a bishop from

Pannonia, one from Gaul (the bishop of Die), one from Calabria, the bishop of Carthage, Hosius of Cordova, and the two representatives of Sylvester from Rome. We may note that there were also some bishops from outside the Empire, among others two Armenians and one Persian.

We shall not insist upon the magnificent solemnities which distinguished the opening of the council. They marked the triumph of the Church after long years of suffering and humiliation. Constantine himself opened the first session, assisted at most of the debates, and even took an active part in them. It appears that it was Hosius who presided at the council, the deputies of the Pope, however, being given places of honour. Although they were simple priests they were the first after Hosius to sign the acts of the council. Different questions, as we have said, figured on the programme, some touching matters of discipline, such as the extinction of a local schism in Alexandria—the introduction of uniform methods for fixing the date of Easter—the reconciliation of the Novatians with the Church—and certain penitential regulations. All these did not call forth any great debate. The chief subject of interest was that of Arius. It was a case of declaring valid or invalid the decisions which had been arrived at in Alexandria.

Arius again explained his doctrine without disguise, as he had formerly done to his bishop. Presented thus crudely, this doctrine was bound to find but a cold reception in the assembly, and the former sentence against the innovator was confirmed. It was, however, thought necessary to indicate in a positive manner the doctrine which

was professed by all. Here difficulties arose. The friends of Arius (and they were numerous enough), without making common cause with him, yet tried to impose a formula of faith more in accordance with his beliefs. It was rejected. Eusebius of Cæsarea, who in reality was not unfavourable to the heretic, claimed to have persuaded the council to accept the baptismal creed of his Church, modified, however, by the important word "consubstantial" (*homoousios*) with the Father as applied to the Son. It is not at all clear that the claim of Eusebius was justified. It appears rather that the Nicene formula, known later as the Nicene Creed, was the outcome of the discussions between Hosius and the Alexandrians (the bishop Alexander and his deacon Athanasius). This creed expressed the faith of the universal Church, in "One God Almighty—one Lord Jesus Christ Son of God only begotten of the Father, that is to say of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father." It is probable that this latter expression represented the contribution of Western theology. This creed, which finished on the words "I believe also in the Holy Ghost," was completed by an explicit condemnation of the Arian doctrine. "With regard to those who say that there was a time when the Son did not exist—that He did not exist before He was begotten—that He was created out of nothing—or who declare that He is of other substance or essence—that He is a creature subject to change, He who is the Son of God—let all such persons be declared anathema by the Catholic Church." The creed being fixed, there remained only the question of the signatures. There was, of course, some resistance. To many,

if for very different reasons, the word consubstantial seemed hard to accept. But in the face of the clearly expressed will of the Emperor, all or nearly all, including Eusebius of Nicomedia and his namesake of Nicæa, finally subscribed. Besides Arius there were only two Egyptian bishops who remained reluctant. To ensure order and discipline these three were exiled to Illyricum. Shortly afterwards the Emperor, having learned that Eusebius of Nicomedia and his namesake of Nicæa were agitating against the decrees of the council, caused them to be arrested and sent to Gaul, at the same time providing substitutes for them. The Arian trouble appeared to be ended by the unanimous consent of the Church, supported by the will of the Emperor. The only thing to be feared was a sudden change in the Imperial sympathies.

The Anti-Nicene Reaction.—Subsequent events proved that such fears were only too well founded. The council was hardly over when a reaction began against the creed which had been solemnly proclaimed. Timid at first and somewhat undecided, this reaction grew bolder day by day. A time soon came when, definitely patronised by the Emperor, the movement gained so much strength that the overthrow of orthodoxy seemed imminent. The different stages of this reaction which began in 330, and led, in 360, to a brilliant triumph, are marked by the dates of political events; and the mere establishment of this fact shows already the real character of the anti-Nicene movement.

It is worth while to pause a while and consider the party which for thirty years made their assaults on the Nicene Creed. Its leaders are the former

friends of Arius, the early "Collucianists" at whose head we find Eusebius of Nicomedia. They were people whose beliefs were fundamentally but little separated from the theology of Arius. Being relatively few in number they had the cleverness to rally to their cause, in a common defiance of the Nicene "consubstantial," many who did not share all their ideas—a wavering mass of the old conservatives in theology, who were troubled in their habit of thought by the sudden introduction of Western terminology into their Eastern conceptions. It was not very difficult to persuade these good people, whose theology was somewhat limited, that the word "consubstantial" compromised the Trinity of persons, and that its insertion in the creed marked a definite return to Sabellianism: the more so as among the warmest defenders of the Nicene formula there were some who professed a theology not altogether above suspicion. The accusation of Sabellianism brought against some of the Nicene defenders is not quite without foundation. It was necessary that some time should elapse before the necessary distinctions could be made on both sides.

At first the question of doctrine was somewhat merged in that of persons. As if a watch-word had been passed, the Eusebians everywhere began to pursue the same tactics: purging the Eastern hierarchy by deposing and replacing all the bishops of any importance who were favourable to Nicene orthodoxy. These once got rid of, and the general body of the Eastern hierarchy thus deprived of its natural leaders, it would, they thought, be easy to impose new tenets of orthodoxy, from which the word consubstantial would be eliminated. What is

difficult to understand is the way in which Constantine lent himself to this manœuvre, even recalling Eusebius of Nicomedia from exile in 328 or 329, and allowing him to take the place of the venerable Hosius as Imperial adviser. More extraordinary even than his return was the power which this cunning prelate was not slow to gain over the mind of his master. From 330 the campaign against those who adhered to the decisions of Nicæa may be regarded as in full progress.

The first victim was Eustathius, bishop of Antioch. In 330 he was deposed by a synod presided over, in his own town, by Eusebius, then on his way back from the Holy Land. The greatest ambition of the Eusebians, however, was the conquest of Alexandria, where a young bishop, Athanasius, who had been remarked at the Nicene council as being particularly anti-Arian, had in 328 replaced Alexander, the first champion of orthodoxy. All the adversaries of Nicæa leagued themselves against Athanasius, and round him all the defenders of the " consubstantial " finally rallied. For thirty-five years he was to be the centre round which all the controversies on the subject of doctrine were to revolve. " The tragedy of Athanasius," as Theodoret calls it, began not long after his nomination to the see. As it was impossible to accuse a man of his theological culture of doctrinal errors, his opponents were forced back upon grievances of a secondary order. Athanasius was partial to energetic methods, and in order to overcome a certain local resistance did not hesitate to have recourse to stringent measures. A day came in the autumn of 325 when at a synod at Tyre, presided over by Eusebius of Cæsarea, Athanasius was called upon to give an explanation of some acts

of violence for which his opponents held him responsible. Condemned by the synod, he went to the court and tried to gain the ear of the Emperor. But the most absurd calumnies had followed him to Constantinople. The Emperor refused to give him a hearing and had him sent to Treves in Gaul, where he was interned. In the meantime the council of Tyre, having moved to Jerusalem for the ceremony of the dedication of the new basilica of the Anastasis (Resurrection), addressed a synodal letter to the Egyptians, enjoining them to readmit to the communion of the Church the friends of Arius, who, they said, had supplied a satisfactory profession of faith. Arius himself had been recalled from exile and rehabilitated on the strength of a not very precise, but relatively orthodox, profession of faith. He probably remained at the court while awaiting his reception into the church of Constantinople. He died suddenly on the very day when this reception was to have taken place. Some time afterwards a synod, assembled in Constantinople, deposed Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, who from the beginning had been an enemy of the Eusebian faction, and who from that time on assumed, in the eyes of faithful adherents of the Nicene Creed, the aspect of a martyr. As a matter of fact he was a doubtful defender of the "consubstantial," as his theology had a marked taint of Sabellianism. For the moment his friends overlooked the difficulties raised by this theology. Marcellus, the victim of the Eusebians, appeared in the light of a confessor of the faith. Other faithful defenders of Nicæa were executed. The East raised no protest against the undertakings of Arius and his party. On the 22nd of May, 337, Constantine died, having received

baptism a few days previously at the hands of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the friend and first defender of Arius. Another end might have been desired for the man who, in 313, had signed the Toleration Edict of Milan.

A period of calm followed upon this death. The three sons of the Emperor, Constantine II, Constans and Constantius, divided the Empire among themselves. Constantine, however, soon followed his father to the grave, leaving Constans master of the West and Constantius ruler of the East. As long as the two brothers reigned together (337-350) Constans, who was favourable to Orthodoxy and more powerful than Constantius, prevented the latter from being dominated by the Arian faction. He also showed himself more disposed to look for arbitration to the Roman Papacy than his father had been before him, and worked hard to bring about a reconciliation between the two parties.

Nearly all the exiled bishops returned to their dioceses at the death of Constantine, but where they had been replaced troubles necessarily sprang up. This was especially the case in Alexandria. Appeals were soon made to Pope Julius from different quarters, and in 339 Athanasius and other victims of the Eusebians arrived in Rome. A Roman synod in 340 re-established them all, including Marcellus of Ancyra. Meanwhile the Eusebians who had assembled in Antioch for the dedication of the new cathedral (340) tried to draw up a dogmatic formula, which, while eliminating crude Arianism, yet did not include the word consubstantial which had been taxed with Sabellianism. Might it not be possible to settle the differences of opinion by uniting the two parties in one common synod? The

two Imperial courts desired this issue. It was arranged to hold in Sardica (Sofia) a great assembly where the Easterns and Westerns could discuss matters together. But instead of arriving at the hoped-for reconciliation, this synod, which was held in 343, only tended to accentuate the breach. Under specious pretexts the Easterns refused to attend the sittings of the Westerns, and separated themselves from communion with Pope Julius; while the Westerns, reinstating without distinction all the victims of the Eusebians, excommunicated the more important leaders of the adverse party, particularly Basil the Eusebian, who had taken the place of Marcellus as bishop of Ancyra. The disciplinary laws passed by the Western members of the council regarding the nomination, removal, trial and degradation of bishops (the most celebrated of which concerned the right of appeal to Rome) did not succeed in effacing the impression of failure made by this great synod of Sardica, after which the differences which divided the Church were only more accentuated than before. The greater part of the East was firmly united against the term "consubstantial," while the West clung to it passionately, upholding all its defenders, even those who were not above suspicion. In the years which followed, the negotiations between the two courts attenuated this division. The East having condemned the bishop of Sirmium (Mitrovitza), Photinus, a disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra, whose doctrine verged on Sabellianism, a gathering of Westerners, assembled in Milan and attended by Roman legates, accepted this decision. Some time afterwards Athanasius also abandoned Marcellus of Ancyra, who had certainly compromised himself, whereupon Athan-

asius was invited by Constantius himself to return to Alexandria in 346.

To ensure the permanence of this truce the collaboration of the two emperors was necessary. But Constans was murdered in 350 by the usurper Magnentius, who succeeded in gaining a certain recognition in the West. Constantius undertook to avenge his brother and to extend his authority over the whole Empire. This conquest of the West was to prove long and dangerous, and was to end only in August, 353, with the defeat of Magnentius under the walls of Lyons. The political conquest was unfortunately also a religious conquest. Relieved of his brother's influence Constantius undertook to ensure the success of the Eusebian reaction in the West as well as in the East. For the moment the question was to make the Latins abandon Athanasius, who, more and more, had become the pivot round which the defence of the word "consubstantial" turned. If only Athanasius were once and for all disposed of, then would be the time to impose upon the whole Church a formula that would be "non-consubstantial." At Arles in 353 the Emperor extorted from the Gallican hierarchy the condemnation of Athanasius. Pope Liberius hoped in vain that the Western episcopacy, on being better informed, would revoke this decision. He urged the convocation of a greater synod which assembled in Milan in 355. With few exceptions the three hundred bishops present yielded to Imperial pressure. Athanasius was again condemned. Pope Liberius refused to acquiesce. He was taken from Rome and exiled to Thracia, while Hosius of Cordova was sent to Sirmium. The overthrow of orthodoxy seemed complete. The final blow was given when

Athanasius was formally proscribed on the 8th of February, 356. The church where he was in the act of celebrating, was invaded by troops, but the bishop succeeded in fleeing, and remained in hiding. Another bishop was elected in his place, who could not, however, have maintained his position but for an unlooked-for alliance between the Arians and the pagans. Scenes of brutality and lechery disgraced the churches of Alexandria and of Egypt. Violence and injustice were paramount. The anti-Nicene party appeared to be finally triumphant. Even Pope Liberius in his exile at Berea decided to abandon Athanasius in order to obtain some alleviation of his own hard lot.

The question of persons thus disposed of, there remained but one thing (for the Eusebians) to do—to impose upon the Church a formula which would not be that of Nicæa. But at this juncture divisions broke out among the victors. Those who had joined forces to obtain the proscription of Athanasius were, later, far from unanimous. If among them there were some unrepentant Arians, proclaiming a complete difference between the Father and the Son, called Anomœans (from the Greek *anomoios* = unlike) a far larger number felt that they could not subscribe to such a negation of traditional belief. And even among these latter there were important shades of difference in thought. On the extreme right of the party there were even personages to be found, fundamentally Catholic, and who merely objected to the word "consubstantial" as in their opinion likely to lead to misunderstandings. For the term *homoousios* (consubstantial) they wished to substitute another differing only in one letter. "Let us affirm," they said, "that the Son

is of similar substance with the Father—*homoiousios*. In this way we safeguard His divinity." Besides the "homoiousians" there were many of less decided opinion, opposed no doubt to the "anomœans" but still more opposed to the partisans of the "homoiousios." These people found that under the vague formula—"The Son is like the Father" (*homoios*) the most varied interpretations might be introduced. The interpretation the most current among these "homœans," or Acacians as they are also called, was completely impregnated with subordinationism. The vagueness of the formula created in itself a danger, so it came about that after a passing triumph of the "anomœans" in 357, there was a lively "homoiousian" reaction the following year, while finally it was "homœism" which gained the favour of Constantius. The Emperor remained attached to this formula. In 359 the courtier-Arian bishops imposed upon the representatives of the Western Church, assembled at Rimini, as well as upon the Easterns assembled at Seleucia, a formula in which the Son was declared similar to the Father *in all things*. But this last clause, with which some of those who signed salved their consciences, disappeared from the official formula as drawn up at Constantinople in January, 360. This official document forbade all discussion on the subject of substance (*ousía*) or hypostasis; repudiated all former creeds, and set aside in advance all those that might be established in the future. "The whole world groans at the thought of having awakened thus to find itself Arian." Penalties were inflicted on all dissidents: those who held too Arian, anomœan views as well as those of Catholic tendency who

clung to the "homoiousios." One special form of Arianism, tinged with subordinationism, had become the State religion.

The Restoration of Orthodoxy.—For a moment the pagan revival introduced by Julian the Apostate united all Christians in face of the common peril (361-363). As soon, however, as it was evident that the Empire could not become pagan again, and could not remain neutral, the question was raised as to which tendency should triumph: the Catholic tendency to which, in general, the West had remained faithful in spite of the passing weakness of Rimini, or the homœan, semi-Arian point of view, to which even the East found difficulty in accommodating itself. If politics had not interfered, and the Church had been given a free hand, it would doubtless have quickly rejected the "homœism" of Rimini—Constantinople. We can follow the process in the West where the neutrality of Valentinian I brought about from one day to another the restoration of orthodoxy. Here, besides, minds were prepared for this Nicene renascence, and the word "consubstantial" could, only under pressure, and in the first shock of surprise, have been eliminated. In the East, the period of convalescence was more protracted. It was first necessary that the Catholic forces, growing conscious of the dangers of "homœism," should pay attention to the fundamental tendencies which united, rather than to the shades of difference which separated, and should reorganise themselves under new heads and new standards, and with new watch-words. In this way a great Catholic party was re-formed, but hardly had it reached its goal when

Imperial hostilities raised obstacles in its way. Long years would be necessary to surmount these.

The story of the Nicene renascence in the West can be told in a few words. From the year 363 Pope Liberius, whom circumstance had happily impeded from attending the council of Rimini, became the arbitrator of the situation. On the one hand he condemned the decisions of Rimini, forbidding at the same time the rebaptism of Arians; on the other hand he was of opinion that in what concerned individuals it would be well to forget the past, and to allow all those who had compromised themselves to be forgiven if only they showed sincerity in their Catholic faith. When Liberius died in 366 and was replaced by Damasus, the situation was saved in the West, and calm almost restored. There remained, it is true, in northern Italy and in corners of Illyricum isolated groups of Arians. We shall see how Ambrose, when bishop of Milan, succeeded in finally getting the better of these. There remained also certain extreme Nicæans, victims of the persecution under Constantius, who, not knowing how to forgive those who had shown weakness, ended by grouping themselves round Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, and in setting up some schismatic communities. But this was not of much importance. The Arian crisis was virtually over as far as the Latin Church was concerned, and this gratifying result can be attributed to the wise policy of Valentinian, who with a jealous care, which some found excessive, avoided all meddling in matters of dogma. The free play of ecclesiastical institutions, and especially the traditional action of the Roman See, were

sufficient to bring things back with comparative ease to normal conditions.

It was quite different in the other half of the Empire, where Valens put at the disposal of "homœism" all the forces at his command. It is true that up to 370, revolts, wars, and foreign enterprises more or less occupied his attention. The Catholic forces profited by this truce to re-group themselves. The composition of this Neo-Nicene party which about 368 opposed itself to the campaign of the "homœans," or Acacians, is one, and not the least, of the surprises to be found in this complicated period of history.

Besides the former adherents of the Nicene Creed and the younger men who had not had time to compromise themselves in dogmatic quarrels, we find in this Neo-Nicene party several men who had formerly been numbered with the Eusebians. There were signs of a formula being established in which all could unite, and people ended by remarking, on one side as on the other, that many misunderstandings had crept into the first discussions. "Homoousios" and "homoiousios": the two terms were, after all, almost synonymous if pains were taken to explain them. The first affirms the essential unity of the divine nature, the second accentuates the distinction of persons. Why should the distinction not be expressed in a more precise manner? Thus a formula came into being which attempted to express in well-chosen words this inexplicable mystery: "Three hypostases in the unity of one essence." At first the Westerns, to whom the word hypostasis was synonymous with substance, rejected this formula. Nor had Athanasius made use of it. In the end, however, he came to see that for the

Easterns the word hypostasis was almost synonymous with "person," but with this shade of difference, that it asserted the actual existence of that which person signified. In 362 Athanasius allowed the formula to be introduced into Alexandria, thus contributing greatly to the pacification of troubled minds.

The quarrels which centred round personal antipathies took longer to settle. The "homoiousians," grouped round Basil of Ancyra, had begun by making peace with the old adherents of the Nicene Creed. Alas! they made an exception of Athanasius, and the exclusion compromised their efforts. But in 366 they were at least admitted to the Roman communion by means of an explicit condemnation of Sabellianism and "homœism." For a moment it appeared that, reunion having been established between Rome and a large number of Oriental bishops, a definite peace was about to be achieved. It was decided that a council was to be held in Tarsus, where Basil of Ancyra was to play an important rôle and to appear as the head of the Neo-Nicene party. Perhaps it was not fitting that the final triumph of orthodoxy should depend upon a personage so compromised. Be that as it may, a sudden order from Valens put an end to the undertaking. God had reserved for purer hands the honour of re-establishing the peace of His Church. Let us at least recognise the happy effects due to the activity of the bishop of Ancyra. It was thanks to him that the situation had considerably changed towards the year 368. There were no more "anomœans"; the two heads of the party, Aëtius and Eunomius, had disappeared for good from the scene of action. Only two parties were left: the

"homœans," or Acacians, holders of the official doctrine of Rimini-Constantinople, and the Neo-Nicenes, the group of which we have just been studying the origin and development. It is between these two, the one heretical, the other Catholic, that the contest was to take place during the last half of the reign of Valens.

"Homœism" boasted the Imperial protection, for Valens, unlike Constantius, who during the whole of his life had yielded to the most contradictory influences, was firmly attached to the "homœan" principles in which he had been born and educated, and was determined to make them triumph by every means in his power. The political events of the first part of his reign, however, did not give him the liberty he desired. It was only in 370 when freed from his most pressing cares, that he began a campaign of unheard-of brutality in favour of "homœism." Visiting the different provinces personally, he insisted that the bishops should subscribe to the creed of Rimini. In cases of refusal the churches were taken from the clergy, the ecclesiastical privileges suppressed, and the monks, who at that time were already fairly numerous, were enrolled in the army. Such measures often led to disturbance and bloodshed. Alexandria, after the death of Athanasius (2nd of May, 375), whom the Emperor had not dared to touch, was once more given over to scenes of horror and obscenity such as, since the year 356, had so often dishonoured it. The mines of Phæno, where the confessors of the faith had suffered during the great persecution, were again filled with Christian convicts. Egypt groaned beneath a new reign of terror.

We do not possess such detailed accounts of the fate of Anatolia and Syria, but we know at least that it was from Cappadocia that the movement of resistance went out against "homœism," then triumphant. Here was to be found the man, who, without arms, without resource, by the mere prestige of his life, the firmness of his opinions, and the perseverance of his action, was to counterbalance the power of official Arianism and finally to triumph over it. This man was Basil, who from 370 was bishop of Cæsarea, the capital of Cappodocia. Around him several men of like mind grouped themselves, his younger brother Gregory of Nyssa, his more than brother Gregory of Nazianzus, and others: Amphilocius of Iconium, Eusebius of Samosata, Apollinaris of Laodicea. This Cappodocian group has a very definite character of its own. These friends were all fervent "Origenists" and at the same time adepts in Hellenic culture, men of agile mind, disposed to unravel difficulties, and capable of clearing up the misunderstandings which for fifty years had weighed heavily upon the Trinitarian question. Their theology can be summed up by the formula of three "hypostases," but it did not confine itself to words; it tried—not always quite successfully—to specify many of those terms: substance — "person" — "self-same" — "specific"—"individual"—"property or virtue"—which lay at the root of the matter. In the midst of these subtle questions the genius of Basil, and still more that of his brother Gregory, moved at ease. This mental agility made it possible for them to consider formulæ the most diverse, instead of clinging tenaciously, as had been done for a long time, to expressions considered unassailable.

In reality what was most needed was not so much speculation as a muster of the forces at command. The large-mindedness of Basil was to contribute wonderfully to bring about a union among those who in this hour, so important for orthodoxy, were willing to think a little less of all that had separated them, and a little more of what ought to unite them. To bring about a union of all true believers, and this union once realised, to establish a close communion with Rome, was in the mind of Basil the first and indispensable step before endeavouring to obtain from Valentine, firmly anchored to a religious neutrality, that intervention in the policy of Valens which might save the cause of orthodoxy in the East. In this work of reconciling the Eastern Church with itself and with Rome, Basil, let it at once be acknowledged, did not always meet with success. He could never overcome the schism which in Antioch separated even the orthodox into different factions, one holding with the bishop Meletius, a friend of Basil's, and the other with Paulinus who, before his return from the East, had been surreptitiously consecrated by Lucifer of Cagliari. Rome also failed in understanding the complexities of the situation, persisting because of false reports, in holding Paulinus alone as orthodox, and repudiating the claims of Meletius, thus compromising Basil's whole policy. It was excusable if, on some occasions, sharp criticism on the subject of Pope Damasus escaped the bishop of Cæsarea. Such criticism was in reality only an expression of the sentiments of deference with which Basil regarded the Roman See. A definite result was obtained in 377 when a synod, presided over by the Pope, condemned certain errors

signalised by Basil as the chief obstacle to the reconciliation of the Easterns. The wisdom of the bishop of Cæsarea was soon to bear fruit.

A time came when Imperial politics helped to undo the knot which they had contributed to tie. On the 9th of August, 358, Valens lost his throne and life in the disastrous battle of Adrianople, where the Goths, for the first time, routed the Roman legions. In order to re-establish the Roman fortunes, Gratian, the sovereign of the West, sent to the rescue his ablest general, Theodosius, who, once the Goth peril was averted, was proclaimed emperor of the East at Sirmium (Mitrovitza) the 19th January, 379. Theodosius was Catholic in thought, completely penetrated with the spirit of the West, and it was he who was to hasten the triumph of the cause so ardently served by Basil of Cæsarea. The latter did not live to see the victory. Worn out with a life of austerity and labour he died on the 1st June, 379, when not yet fifty years old. But his spirit survived; in the autumn of the same year one hundred and fifty of the Eastern bishops assembled in Antioch under the leadership of Meletius and subscribed to all the dogmatic documents sent by Pope Damasus. They then addressed to the bishops of Italy and Gaul a synodal letter expressing their complete acquiescence in orthodoxy.

The Church of the East began by helping itself. Providence was about to help it by the hands of Theodosius. After having cleared Illyricum of the barbarians who had invaded it, the new sovereign set about pacifying the minds of his subjects. In February, 380, he received baptism at the hands of the orthodox bishop Ascolus and he promulgated an edict obliging all Christians " to profess the religion

which the apostle Peter taught formerly in Rome and which is now represented by Pope Damasus and Peter of Alexandria." On the 24th of November of the same year he made his solemn entry into Constantinople and installed in the Church of the Holy Apostles Gregory of Nazianzus, who during the previous year had been fighting for orthodoxy in the capital. Theodosius decided at the same time to convoke an Eastern council in Constantinople. It was held the following year and helped to complete in the countries of Greek language the work of Nicene restoration.

This work, however, was not brought to a successful issue without difficulties. Very soon personal antipathies began to trouble a movement which needed calm for its development. Gregory of Nazianzus, recognised as bishop of Constantinople and then, on the death of Meletius, as president of the council, became so discouraged that he resigned the presidency of the council and also his bishopric, and retired for good. Discussions about his successor led to quarrels between the Alexandrians and the Asiatics, and the greater churches suspected and were jealous of one another. Some disciplinary canons of the time reveal to us this disastrous state of things. The third of these canons, which recognised that the bishop of Constantinople, the "new Rome," should be granted pre-eminence (*honoris causa*) over all his colleagues of the East, was destined to have serious consequences. Dogmatic questions were happily settled in a more satisfactory manner. The fathers confirmed the faith of Nicæa, anathematising all heretics who were opposed to it "Eunomians, or Anomœans, Arians or Eudoxians" (this latter was another name

given to the homœans attached to the creed of Rimini-Constantinople), "semi-Arians or Pneumatomachoi" (adversaries of the divinity of the Holy Ghost), "Sabellians, and Apollinarians." To the errors already condemned at Nicæa the council added, as we see, those which had arisen at a later date: the sects of the Apollinarians, of whom more anon, of the Pneumatomachoi who, after having made some stir since the year 360, suddenly disappeared. To condemn these latter was to proclaim the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Later this belief was to be positively expressed in the creed called that of Nicæa-Constantinople (the creed of the Mass), about which, however, it is not certain that it was officially composed or promulated by the council.

According to the design of those who organised it, the council of Constantinople was intended to be merely an Eastern council. It was only later that it was put on the same footing as that of Nicæa and counted as the second of the œcumenical councils. At the time, and because of certain resistance shown in the West against several of the solutions adopted *de facto* by this synod of Constantinople, the two sovereigns conceived the idea of holding in Rome an assembly composed of delegates of the two churches, East and West, in order to complete the work of pacification. But the Roman council, to which the Easterns sent only three or four delegates, did not have the importance which it should have had. Time was needed to arrange everything; the essential was that the East should have eliminated little by little the poison of Arianism, and this it had practically done. The Imperial protection, which for so long a time had favoured the heresy, was now

accorded to Nicene consubstantialism. Arianism had passed like a bad dream, at least within the Roman Empire.

On the banks of the Danube it tended at this very time, however, to become the national religion of the Goths. It is not a matter of indifference that the first contact with Christianity which the barbarians knew revealed to them only this imperfect Christianity, known as the "homœism" of Rimini. Illyricum, the stronghold of this creed, had become also since 360 a centre for its propaganda. Carried by the Goths, "homœism" spread beyond the Danube and across the plains of Germany, thus bringing a contaminated Christianity to the various barbarian tribes. The time was near at hand when, the barriers of the Rhine and the Danube breaking at the same time, the barbarians were to descend upon the Empire and to bring back to it the Arianism which was supposed to have disappeared. It is not the place here to speak of the consequences which the state of things was to have upon the future of Europe. Towards the end of the fourth century, during the powerful reign of Theodosius, the Empire knew once more the benefits of a "Roman" peace. Even in theological dissensions there was a truce. It was, however, not to be of long duration.

CHAPTER III

THE WEST ON THE EVE OF THE INVASIONS

Rome—Northern Italy—Gaul and Britain—Spain—Africa —Donatism—Pelagianism.

BEFORE bidding good-bye to the West which, in the first years of the fifth century, began to be invaded by the barbarians, and where from this time the Middle Ages commence, it is advisable to retrace rapidly the religious history of its different provinces.

Rome.—One city calls especially for attention, Rome, whose rôle as capital of Christianity was accentuated more and more during the fourth century. At this time no one would dream of attributing the prominence which it enjoyed, and which from the first had been so remarkable, to its unique position within the Empire. From the end of the third century, Rome was no longer the usual Imperial residence; but at the very moment when it was losing this prerogative, its action upon the life of the Church became more marked. It is certainly true that the first popes were occupied chiefly with the local affairs of the Roman community. Marcellinus (296-304) whose pontificate coincided with the great

persecution, and Marcellus (308-309), were obliged to occupy themselves with the fatal consequences of that crisis. Miltiades (311-314), who assisted at the triumph of Constantine over Maxentius, and who benefited by it, was the first to occupy the palace of the Lateran which was to be for centuries the residence of the popes. Sylvester I (314-335) devoted himself to the administration of the diocese of Rome, where it was necessary to provide for the religious wants of a community which, after the official recognition of Christianity, began to increase prodigiously. His early biographers seem to have been struck by the number and grandeur of the buildings he erected and the magnificence of the gifts he was able to make to different churches. They tell us hardly anything of his action in the great Arian crisis. It appears evident that the interference of Constantine in ecclesiastical affairs somewhat relegated to the background the practical authority of the Roman See. With Julius, on the contrary (337-352), whose pontificate succeeded the short one of Marcus (January to October, 336), "the Papacy enters into action again." Julius received the appeal of the Oriental bishops, victimised by the Eusebians, rehabilitated Athanasius and Marcellus, and assisted at the solemn proclamation at Sardica of the traditional pre-eminence of the Roman See. As much can be said of Liberius (352-366), the firm defender during the first years of his papacy of Nicene orthodoxy; yielding, it is true, for a moment to a passing and personal weakness in 357, he effaced this fault by his firm and capable policy, which in the following years led, as we have seen, to the definite pacifying of the West. Damasus who succeeded him (366-384) can have played no less important rôle, for

it was his action that led to a final reconciliation between the East and West in the matter of Nicene orthodoxy. Damasus was not so happy in his Roman relations, for during his entire pontificate he was attacked by a determined competitor, Ursicinus, and after the exile of this latter was a prey to the machinations of the Ursicinians who remained in Rome. It is to Damasus that the archæologists owe gratitude for having preserved in the Roman catacombs the relics of the early Christian Ages, while the students of the Bible are indebted to him for having encouraged the first efforts of St Jerome, and for having given to the latter's studies the bent which this great exegete was afterwards to follow. Siricius (384-399) had not to suffer from the difficulties which had poisoned the pontificate of his predecessor. There was, it is true, talk in his time of quarrels between the monks and their adversaries. The anti-ascetical tendency was represented by one Jovinianus, a renegade monk, who in the excitement of controversy ended by denying the special merit of chastity, and by attacking the virginity of Mary. He was refuted with incredible energy by St Jerome, who had taken refuge in Bethlehem. Jovinianus was finally condemned by Pope Siricius.

The successor of Siricius, Anastasius I (399-400), was called upon to take part in the first Origenist controversy, and gave evidence of great prudence. Innocent I (401-417) was a Pope whose pontificate was one of the most important in the history of the Church. We shall soon see the value of his decisions in the Pelagian question, and we must bear in mind the force with which he affirmed the rights of the Roman See, first as patriarchate of the West, and then with regard to the whole of Christendom.

His firm and prudent attitude obtained for the Apostolic See a consideration which could not be shaken even by the administration, sometimes capricious and unregulated of his successor Zozimus (417-418). Troubled in the beginning by the rivalry of Eusebius, the pontificate of Boniface I (418-422) was not very brilliant, but with Celestine I (422-432) and Sixtus III (432-440) the papacy assumed a certain grandeur of aspect. The Pope became the arbitrator in the great dogmatic controversies which had begun again to trouble the East, while in Italy, where the remnants of the Roman Empire were crumbling, the papacy appeared as the last rampart against the encroachment of barbarism. Already at the beginning of the fifth century Innocent I had known how to soften the exigent Alaric; in 452 Leo I turned Attila and his army away from Italy; in 455 he obtained from Genseric a promise that Rome would be spared the horrors of fire and carnage. All this shows that a new era had begun in the West. In the epoch which follows we shall find the popes more or less actively engaged in the controversies of the East, and we shall make use of that opportunity to appreciate, in passing, their characters and their influence upon events.

Northern Italy.—If we turn to the latter half of the third century in northern Italy we come across a man who sums up the religious history of this part and of the neighbouring provinces: he was Ambrose, bishop of Milan from 374. His accession to the see of this great metropolis was a sign that the Arian domination was broken in the West—that the regrettable incidents of the council of 355

were to be completely forgotten, and that the tyrannic episcopacy of the Arian, Auxentius, who had asserted himself against everybody and in everything, had passed away like a nightmare. Son of the Prefect of Gaul, himself former consul of the provinces of Aemilia and Liguria, Ambrose, who was elected bishop by a peculiar train of circumstances, was destined to exercise a preponderating influence in the restoration of Catholic orthodoxy.

The provinces of the Danube had been lost to orthodoxy and given over to "homœism," owing to the machinations of two deplorable individuals, Uracius, bishop of Singidunum (Belgrade), and Valens, bishop of Mursa (Eszeg). At the death of Germinus, bishop of Sirmium (Mitrovitza), Ambrose was able to replace him by a Catholic. Other bishops being troubled asked to be judged by a council. This was called together at Aquileia in September, 381, by Ambrose, and he himself directed the debates in the spirit of a Roman magistrate. The accused were called upon to submit or to resign.

In A.D. 385 in Milan itself the great bishop had to bestir himself in order to prevent another Auxentius from obtaining from the Empress Justina, who was favourable to the Arians, the grant of a church which was to be taken from the Catholics. Ambrose held his own valiantly at the court, which on many occasions had been obliged to have recourse to his aid in the political difficulties in which it floundered. After the death of Justina, Valentinian II fell under the influence of Ambrose, who expected much from the piety of this amiable prince. The young sovereign was, however, murdered

by the Frank, Argobast, without even having received baptism, to administer which Ambrose had hastened to him. Theodosius revenged the death of Valentinian, and between the great emperor and the great bishop close relations sprang up much to the benefit of religion. Ambrose nevertheless was no flatterer, and on one memorable occasion (after the bloody repression of the mutiny in Thessalonica) he was not afraid to impose with due severity upon the emperor the necessary satisfaction, a famous example of the power of a great bishop over a sovereign who was also a great Christian. Theodosius and Ambrose followed each other closely to the grave; the former died 17th January, 395, the latter on Easter night 397. By the side of the weak Honorius, the heir of Theodosius in the West, there was no Ambrose to be found. At the court of Ravenna where the last remnant of Roman Imperialism had foregathered, there was nothing to recall the large activity, the large spirit of the imposing bishop of Milan.

Gaul and Britain.—In the same way that Gaul had hardly known the sorrows of the great persecution, so it was hardly shaken by the Arian crisis. At most it was troubled by the Western campaign of Constantius between 352 and 360.

At the synod of Arles in 353 the hierarchy of Gaul was obliged to yield to Imperial pressure, and to condemn Athanasius; the compromising signatures were extorted from the bishops who were not present. Hilary, the bishop of Poitiers, was the soul of the resistance against the Arian invasion. A synod held at Beziers deposed him and Constantius exiled him to the East. As a matter of

fact, this exile was most fortunate, because it enabled him to study on the spot the infinite complexities of the problem. A predecessor of Basil and the Gregories, he knew how to establish between the adversaries of the Nicene creed the necessary distinctions. First at Seleucia and then at Constantinople in 359, Hilary proved a stumbling-block to all "homœan" enterprises. It was decided that he should be sent back to Gaul. At that time it was Julian who was in authority in Gaul, Julian still a Christian, but indifferent to the theological disputes in which his cousin took pleasure. He allowed Hilary to organise in Gaul a regular Nicene reaction which had its point of departure in the council of Paris held in 360. When Hilary died (14th January, 366) orthodoxy was restored throughout Gaul. Another great name sheds lustre upon this country in the last quarter of the fourth century, that of Martin, bishop of Tours (373-397). The disciple of Hilary, who had introduced him into the ranks of the clergy, he was also in France the first representative of the monastic ideal which he had learnt to value in Milan. Founder of the monasteries of Ligugé and later of Marmoutier, he undertook in the Western provinces an active campaign against paganism which was still very much alive in these parts. On the whole, however, and if we except the remote districts of Armorica, Christianity was gaining rapidly. All the "civitates" of Gaul from the Rhine to the Ocean, and from the Pyrenees to the North Sea, were soon to have their bishoprics; more numerous in the South-East, more dispersed in the North and West. Unfortunately the invasions which began in 406, and of which

successive waves were to pass over this unhappy country, rendered very precarious the life of the Gallic Roman Church, which had appeared so rich in hope and promise at the end of the fourth century.

Great Britain.—The early religious history of Great Britain remains shrouded in obscurity. It is nevertheless certain that an ecclesiastical hierarchy had been established there by the fourth century. Bishops of York, of London and Lincoln assisted at the council of Arles in 314. Britons were present at the council of Rome in 358; British Christianity tried even to break "the wall of the Picts." In 390 a Briton, Ninian, was ordained at Rome, as future bishop of the Picts and Scots of the north. But there was as yet no question of Ireland, the evangelisation of which was to begin only a little later, at a time when the churches of Britain itself were about to disappear before the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons.

Spain.—Spain was little troubled by the Arian crisis and was quickly to recover from the prevarications of Rimini which did not seriously affect the Spanish hierarchy. After the death of Constantius, however, at the time of the official restoration of orthodoxy, one bishop attracted attention. Not having yielded at Rimini himself, he made this a pretence for excluding from communion with his church all those who had shown weakness. This was Gregory, bishop of Elvira in Granada, who acted in fact much in the same way as Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sicily. This very limited schism died with its founder, but towards the end of the century

the peninsula was troubled by a movement which had lasting effects. This Priscillianist movement, about which the last word has not yet been said, takes its name from a certain Priscillian, a rich, distinguished, and learned man, whose action began to make itself felt towards 370 in the province of Tarraconasia. His influence was exercised chiefly in the direction of strict asceticism which he imposed upon all his followers, but this practice, it appears, was founded upon theories which were not above suspicion. Manichæism, a syncretic religion, with a doctrine tending to dualism, had spread from Persia at the end of the third century, and after gaining ground in Africa had by this time penetrated to Spain. It is thought, though it cannot be proved, that the asceticism taught by Priscillian was in some way connected with the dualistic doctrines of Manichæism. So much is certain, that its adepts grouped themselves in secret societies, which, at least at certain seasons of the year, separated themselves from the general church, and avoided all the meetings of the ordinary communities. In these closed circles, besides the canonical scriptures, various apochryphal writings were read with predilection, writings which outwardly resembled the holy books, but in which special place was given to everything that tended to enforce an intransigent asceticism; going even so far as to condemn marriage. These doctrines, however, drew less attention than the peculiar behaviour of the partisans of Priscillian. Several bishops began to accuse of heresy these people of mysterious bearing. The most violent of their enemies was Idacius, bishop of Emerita. But Priscillian had also devoted adherents, and the council convoked at Saragossa

in 380, although it condemned certain practices, such as fasting on Sunday, and the custom of bringing the Eucharist to the home instead of consuming It in the church, did not venture to attack the head of the movement. Priscillian even succeeded some time after this event in causing himself to be elected bishop of Avilla. The anti-Priscillian opposition increased, but the energetic leader held his own. He had so much influence that a criminal process was undertaken against one of his most fiery adversaries, Ithacius, bishop of Ossonova.

Then a political upheaval completely changed the situation. Priscillian had found some support with the functionaries of the emperor Gratian. When Gratian was overthrown and assassinated by the usurper Maximus (383), Spain passed into the hands of the latter, and the position of Priscillian was at once changed. Ithacius gained favour at the court of Treves, which sent to the bishop of Avilla an order that he had to appear before a Gallic council having its seat in Bordeaux. Threatened with being deposed, Priscillian had the regrettable idea to demand a hearing at the Imperial tribunal of Treves. In spite of the energetic intervention of St Martin of Tours, the process, strongly upheld by Ithacius, ended in a capital sentence. Convicted of having given himself to practices of magic, Priscillian was condemned to death and beheaded with six of his followers, one of whom, Euchrotia, was a lady of high rank. A military commission was sent to Spain which took active measures to discover the partisans of the condemned bishop. Other executions took place. These atrocities called forth protestations from the bishops of Gaul. Martin of Tours, after having returned in

all haste to Treves, would have nothing to say to "the bloody bishops." Pope Siricius, although remonstrated with, refused communion with Rome to Ithacius and his followers. Ambrose, who arrived at this juncture to negotiate political affairs with Maximus, declared that he would have no relations with the bishops who had demanded the death of the heretics. After the downfall of Maximus they were abandoned by all. Ithacius was deposed; Idacius was constrained to resign. This is not to say that Martin, Ambrose, and Siricius in any way approved the Priscillianist movement; in their eyes the man condemned at Treves, and his adherents, were certainly heretics. When the Priscillianists wished to re-enter the Church, they were called upon to express their disapproval of Priscillian's doctrines. A long time had to elapse before Spain could be pacified. Priscillians continued to exist for many years in Gallicia. On the other hand the more decided anti-Priscillianists separated themselves from the communion of Rome. In this way schisms continued until the barbarian invasions, which imposed upon Christian Spain many other trials.

Africa.—Donatism. Calm had not come to Africa either at the end of the fourth century. The Donatist controversy was still to cause agitation for a long time, and when this was virtually appeased, a doctrinal question of far greater importance was to spring up, one which would be of capital importance for the future of Christianity; we mean the Pelagian controversy.

The history of Donatism after Constantine can be summed up in a few lines. In less than twenty

years, as we have already seen, this schism was organised throughout Roman Africa. There was hardly a town or colony, however unimportant, where there was not a schismatic community, with bishop, priests and deacons, in open war with the Catholic community. If, in some places, there was only one church, in all probability it would be Donatist. Wherever they found themselves in power, the sectarians did not even hesitate to compel the Catholics, by persuasion, menace, or brutality to pass over to the ranks of the schismatics, and tried, by renewing their baptism, to enrol them in their own ranks. The last years of Constantine saw these troubles increase. After 337 Constans, under whose jurisdiction Africa had fallen, undertook to reconcile the two churches. He tried first by gentle means, sending Imperial emissaries through the provinces armed with considerable sums of money, exhorting the Donatists to submit to the jurisdiction of the Catholic bishops. Some acquiescence was thus bought, but these milder measures proved nearly always ineffectual and recourse was had to force. The emissaries now appeared escorted by soldiers. The basilicas of the Donatists were taken, their more extreme leaders were imprisoned or exiled, among others Donatus, who died in exile 355. All this did not take place without skirmishes and disturbance, and there was bloodshed. "The church of the martyrs" gained new lustre. It appears, nevertheless, that towards 350 the schism, deprived of its ablest leader, lost its vigour. The advent of Julian in 361 gave it new force: the exiles of the preceding reign reappeared, and their return was the signal for bloody reprisals. Valentinian and Gratian tried to re-establish the

authority of the law. Too feebly applied, the measures taken by them had not much effect. Even the numerous dissensions within the party itself did not succeed in weakening its power. Divided on many points among themselves, the Donatists were always united in their hatred of the Catholics. Then, about the year 390, when the Church in Africa was more and more losing prestige, a man appeared who was to lend it a lasting and brilliant lustre. This man was Augustine, at that time about forty years of age, since he had been born at Tagaste in 354. After a childhood which was pious and Christian although he had not received baptism, Augustine had given himself to a life of dissipation and had taken refuge away from the Church with the Manichæans. Professor of rhetoric at Carthage, and later at Rome, he achieved finally in Milan under the pulpit of Ambrose the calming of his mind, and the conversion of his heart. In 387 he received baptism, and his conversion was complete. In 388 he returned to Tagaste where he retired into solitude, giving himself to study and prayer. Then one day when he had gone to Hippo on some religious business, a crowd of Christians who were anxious to gain for themselves the treasures of learning and sanctity which they believed him to possess, led him, almost by force, to the veteran bishop Valerius, who imposed hands upon him. Having become priest at Hippo, Augustine was soon made the coadjutor (396) and later the successor of Valerius. From 393 he is the great light of the Church of Africa. A day was to come when he would be considered one of the greatest doctors of the universal church.

At first Augustine had devoted himself to com-

bating Manichæism, of which the attractions were known to him by personal experience. But when he became priest and bishop of Hippo he saw that the great danger of the moment was the Donatist schism. His ideal was not to crush the dissenting church but to lead it back by a peaceful method of courteous discussion, bringing it in this way to recognise the principles upon which the legitimacy of the Catholic Church is founded. Augustine made much of public debate—of controversy between opponents—where his lively dialectic could quickly surprise and overcome an adversary. When he could not argue orally with the Donatist leaders he took his pen and crushed them with his treatises. But to those who surrounded Augustine this method appeared too slow, and in 401 they obtained the first Edict of Union from Ravenna from the emperor Honorius. Negligently executed, with alternating laxity and violence, it produced the contrary effect to that which had been expected. The Donatist propaganda recommenced with renewed violence. Augustine carried on the counter-attack vigorously, by controversy, by polemical writing, by missions organised to meet the offensive. The bishop of Hippo desired especially to have a great conference held in which the representatives of the two hierarchies might meet, and where open discussion might influence public opinion, enlighten minds, and gain hearts. This conference finally took place in Carthage in 411. Augustine was the soul of the enterprise. The Prætor Marcellinus, specially appointed by the Emperor to follow the debates, after having listened to the defence of both parties, declared in favour of the Catholic claims. This sentence was made the excuse for another Edict

of Union, issued by Honorius in January, 412. Applied in a merciless manner, this edict succeeded in seriously disorganising the Donatist church. From this time the Donatist schism existed no longer except in conventicles, of which the leaders succeeded in evading the Imperial police. Without being a partisan of "dragonnades" Augustine, who had shown at first the greatest open-mindedness, ended by remarking, that certainly under the given circumstances of time and place, coercion had had more tangible results than free discussion. Perhaps the recollection of this fact influenced his attitude somewhat too much in the course of the Pelagian controversy which broke out just at that moment.

Pelagianism.—This heresy began in Africa about 410. Among the numerous Roman refugees in Carthage, who had fled from the Goth invasion under Alaric, were two personages who were destined to great celebrity: the monk Pelagius and his disciple Caelestius. The former had gained some repute among the pious in Rome on account of his virtue, his austere life and his rigorous direction of souls. A spiritual adviser much appreciated by devout persons, Pelagius strongly insisted with them on the rôle that the will must play in the achievement of Christian perfection. By dint of insisting on this he came to forget the part attributed at all times by Catholic tradition to the divine aid in the great work of sanctification. He spoke certainly of grace, but what he understood by grace was not so much those interior touches which sometimes affect the soul as a caress, and sometimes uproot it to the depths of its being,

forcing it to act, but rather all those exterior helps to the will which maintain this latter in the right path: such as, for instance, noble aspirations of the soul towards what is beautiful and good—the precepts of divine law together with the menace and encouragement to be found in this law, and above all the good example of Jesus Christ. When he was made to see how all these helps often left the will weak and uncertain, how perversities, weaknesses, cowardices, lurked in the depths of even the most advanced soul, Pelagius perhaps agreed, but he would not acknowledge that such weakness in man came from the tares of original sin, and was the heritage of that first fault. Without doubt he might have found in the Epistle to the Romans a precise doctrine on original sin, but in his commentary on the Pauline epistles, which he had brought out a short time before, he managed to get rid of these all-important texts with a culpable ease. As regards sin, he would only recognise personal actual sin, and if anybody objected and pointed out the immemorial custom of the Church in administering baptism to infants, at least when in danger of death, conferring the sacrament "for the remission of sin," he got out of the difficulty by arguments which did more credit to his subtlety than to his honesty.

It is curious that this teaching, presented at first, it is true, in all prudence, and under the cloak of a great desire for perfection, did not in the beginning cause much anxiety in Roman circles. But in Augustine it was to find an implacable enemy. No one was better able to recognise instinctively the unreligious character of this stoical morality than the bishop of Hippo. Converted himself to faith

and virtue by an overwhelming stroke of grace, Augustine had experienced in his own person the profound corruption of human nature, the absolute need of divine succour, and the complete gratuity of grace. Already in the first years of his episcopacy he had edited, in reply to some questions of the Bishop Simplicianus of Milan, a short treatise which summed up in a striking manner all the essential points of his doctrine upon the subject of grace and its free distribution by God.

It was nevertheless not Augustine who splintered the first lance in this discussion, occupied as he was at the time, by the great anti-Donatist controversy of 411; neither was it Pelagius, who had soon left Africa for Palestine, but his disciple Caelestius who had remained in Africa. Franker than his master in his explanations, he did not fail to cause scandal. Denounced by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, he was obliged to appear before a local synod, which condemned half a dozen propositions drawn from his works. This condemnation was intended chiefly to safeguard the doctrine of original sin which drew down upon Adam and his race such dire consequences for soul and body. The doctrine of grace was implied rather than explicitly expounded. Called upon to retract, Caelestius refused. He was excommunicated, left Carthage, and retired to Ephesus, where he succeeded in getting admitted to the ranks of the regular clergy. More optimistic in their conception of human nature, the Easterns do not seem to have been so quickly roused by certain Pelagian propositions as the Africans had been. We can see this in Palestine during the years that follow. Pelagius had arrived there in 411 and had been well received

by John, bishop of Jerusalem. This circumstance had at once awakened the suspicions of St Jerome, then a monk at Bethlehem, and who had had several heated disputes with John in the preceding years. With Jerome doctrinal polemics quickly turned to personal questions. He began to attack bitterly the doctrine which Pelagius, the friend of John, was propagating in the monastic centres of the Holy Land. But Jerome's theology on this subject was a little short-sighted. He threw himself with his usual ardour upon the single thesis of Pelagius concerning the possibility of being without sin. Torrential and unclear, Jerome's argument was encumbered with paradoxes, of which some, to the good fortune of Pelagius, were certainly inopportune. In January or February, 415, a young Spaniard called Orosius, whom Augustine had sent to Jerome's school, arrived in Bethlehem. But neither he nor the hermit of Bethlehem were intellectually equal to the task of assimilating the subtle and profound theology of the African doctor; and their polemic against Pelagius suffered from their incapacity. They then tried to inflame the local episcopate against the innovator, and the result was still more regrettable. Two assemblies, one at Jerusalem, the other at Diospolis, in the course of the year 415, declared Pelagius innocent. In reality the doctrine expressed in these two synods was orthodox, and Pelagius had been absolved, only on condition that he himself denied the errors, reproved by the council of Carthage in 411. Still the fact remained that the person of Pelagius came unscathed through the affair.

Africa grew alarmed. In the course of the year 416 two large synods were held simultaneously at

Mileve and at Carthage. Augustine was the moving spirit of the first, the primate Aurelius of the second. In these synods the existence of original sin was affirmed and the absolute need of divine aid in the avoidance of sin: particular emphasis was laid upon an idea which Augustine had just propounded; namely that the new doctrines were in contradiction with the traditional usages of the Church: frequent prayer, and the baptism of small children. An account of the proceedings was sent to Pope Innocent I with the request to second the decisions of the synod. By a series of letters, dated January, 417, the Pope approved the judgment of the double synod as far as doctrine was concerned. With regard to the authors of the heresy, Pelagius and Caelestius, they were to be regarded as excommunicated, until such time as they would give proof of their innocence. "The campaign is terminated," exclaimed Augustine.

But alas! it was not so. Some months later Pope Zozimus, prevailed upon by personal influences, allowed the African condemnation to be called in question, on the pretext of submitting not only the matter of doctrine but also the question of persons to a fresh examination. The primate of Africa, Aurelius, whose feelings were roused, called together a plenary council in Carthage in 418. A series of nine canons (laws) was drawn up, specifying once more the Augustinian doctrine, to which all Africa rallied. At the same time a decree was passed ratifying the former decisions. The acts of this council were sent to the Pope. In the meantime the civil condemnation of Pelagius, Caelestius and their companions had been obtained from the court of Ravenna. Pope Zozimus confirmed the sentence.

A "tractoria" was addressed by him to the general body of the Church in which the new heresies were condemned. The East at last woke up to the danger. Pelagius was obliged to leave Palestine, and Caelestius Ephesus. After this their traces are difficult to follow.

Supported by the rescript of Honorius, the "tractoria" obtained quickly enough the adherence of the whole hierarchy. Nevertheless a little group of opponents formed in Italy round Julian, bishop of Eclanum. Zozimus suspended them, and they had to take refuge in the East, where some of them might be found again grouped round Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia. The literary polemics continued. Julian, who had become the real head of the Pelagian movement, and who was a merciless dialectician, and a wily controversialist, did not cease to attack the teaching of Augustine, in whom he pretended to find a defender of Manichæism. The bishop of Hippo replied with admirable moderation to all these attacks, taking trouble to reproduce the whole argument of his adversary, even to the wounding personalities directed against himself, and urging with unalterable serenity the doctrine which more and more had taken definite shape in his mind. When he died, the 28th of August, 430, he left unfinished a voluminous work against Julian. From the ramparts of the besieged city of Hippo he had looked down upon the camp fires of the Vandals, who were to be henceforward the masters of Roman Africa.

It was not only against the Pelagians that Augustine had had to struggle in his last years. In centres strongly Catholic, alarm was taken at the harshness of certain Augustinian doctrines, on

the subject of predestination and the distribution of grace. It cannot be denied that ever since 397 a system ruled by merciless logic had taken hold of the master mind of Hippo. Hard and cold as steel, this system of thought had grown only more finely tempered in the course of the controversy. Its starting-point was the sad state into which original sin had thrown humanity. Included, so to speak, in the will of Adam, all humanity had, by that first prevarication, been changed into a condemned mass (*massa damnata*) which God might, in all justice, have destined in its entirety to eternal punishment; but as a matter of fact, God had of His own will and without any regard to previous merit, separated a certain number (a *small* number) of men of whom to make His elect, and had predestined to them, from that time, and to them exclusively, the efficacious means of eternal salvation. It is then impossible according to this system to say that God wishes to save all men. Besides, the efficacy of grace is represented as depending entirely on the will of God, who although respecting human liberty, yet knows how to lead it infallibly to the goal marked by predestination. Taking into consideration the further theory that original sin, if not essentially constituted by, is at least manifested, by unregulated appetites (especially by the sexual appetite), that all the movements of these appetites are in themselves sins, although not imputed as sins to those who have been regenerated in baptism, and that in consequence, without grace there is nothing in us but misery and sin; taking all this into consideration we form some notion of the synthesis, which Augustine opposed to the naturalism of Pelagius. As can be seen, this system was composed of very different elements,

some universally accepted, others contestable, and a few which we must not hesitate to find false.

It is therefore easy to understand that this Augustinian doctrine met with opposition, nowhere more so than in the south of Gaul in the Isle of Lerins, and at Marseilles, the first centres of Gallic monasticism. In these centres of which Vincent, abbot of Lerins, and Cassian, abbot of St Victor, were the leading spirits, reaction against the theories of Augustine inclined people, not of course to rally to Pelagianism, but still to accentuate the rôle which human goodwill plays in the matter of salvation. According to these Massilians, God does not do *all* in *all* souls. If in some He acts with absolute mastery without waiting for any co-operation on their part, in others His grace is gently solicited by good dispositions. God cast down Saul on the road to Damascus, but He also sent Peter to the centurion Cornelius, "whose prayers and good works had mounted even to Him."

No, human nature was not so corrupt as was made out by the bishop of Hippo; and it was with a prevision of the good reception made by each soul to His calls, that God, desiring the salvation of all men, drew up the lists of the predestined. We can see exactly in how far this system of the Massilians, with its occasional incoherences, was opposed to the Augustinian rigidity. The controversialists who, at a comparatively late date, applied to this mode of thought the term semi-Pelagian, committed an error of appreciation, which for a long time stood in the way of an exact understanding of this anti-Augustine movement.

Augustine, put on his guard by some friends whom he had on the spot, proceeded to reply to these

unexpected attacks. He died before having said his last word on the subject. His disciples, though somewhat oppressed by so formidable an inheritance, yet continued the controversy. The most tenacious of them, Prosper of Aquitania, ended by finding the vulnerable point in the Massilian doctrine. This doctrine taught that the human will could take the first step towards God (in theological terms they accepted grace "adjuvans" but denied, at least in certain circumstances, the necessity of prevenient grace). Expressed without the necessary distinctions this doctrine contained an error, which Prosper wished to see condemned by the Apostolic See. The latter avoided any pronouncement upon a matter so delicate. All that Prosper could obtain was a letter from Pope Celestine to the bishops of Provence enjoining them to honour the memory of Augustine who had died in communion with the Holy See. More explicit is another document, issued some years later by the pontifical chancery. "The Massilians," it says, "claim to submit exclusively to the decisions of the Apostolic See; let us then examine what these decisions have been. They show clearly the traditional doctrine of the necessity of prevenient grace and of a special gift of perseverance. As regards the profounder and more difficult questions raised by the Augustinian synthesis, the Holy See refuses to solve them in favour of either party." This document was never officially promulgated, but it best represents the Roman position at the moment at which it was composed (towards 440) and at the time of the controversies which followed. It was this same attitude which the Apostolic See invariably maintained throughout the dogmatic troubles which agitated Provence (now Burgundy) at the beginning

of the following century. Rome finally approved in 530 the decisions, or rather circumscribed council, held the preceding year at Orange, which fixed the traditional points of the Augustinian teaching, while keeping clear of the harshnesses of his system touching on predestination and reprobation. The controversy was not to be resumed in its main issue until the Carolingian epoch.

CHAPTER IV

THE EAST IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

The Church of the East—The Origenist Disputes—Nestorianism—Monophysitism.

THE death of Theodosius, 395, is an important date in both religious and political history, marking as it does the point when the unity of the Empire, held more or less together till this date, is definitely sacrificed. From this time there were to be two empires, as for some time there had been two sovereigns. In the hands of the weak Honorius the Empire of the West was not long in crumbling; under his successors, who were still weaker, it ended by disappearing without stir, as without glory. In 476 Odoacer, the barbarian, deposed the last emperor, and sent to Constantinople the insignia of Imperial dignity.

The Empire of the East was also to know rude assaults and terrible crises, but it succeeded for a long time in surmounting them and in maintaining the ancient frontiers of the "Romania." It is the religious history of this Empire from the beginning of the fifth to the end of the seventh century that we wish briefly to review. The beginning of this epoch was of capital importance for Christian dogma,

which at that time took definite shape. The fourth century had elaborated the teaching concerning the Trinity; Christology was now to be given precision, and to find at Chalcedon in 451 its final expression. At the same time the Greek Church constituted itself definitely with its hierarchy traced along the lines of the civil hierarchy; with its peculiar spirit of submission to Imperial authority, and instinctive mistrust of the Apostolic See.

The Church of the East.—A glance at the map of the Empire will help us to understand the ecclesiastical organisation of the East. Diocletian, at the beginning of the third century, had increased the number of provinces and grouped them in hierarchical order. Several provinces together formed a diocese; these dioceses, of which there were eight in the East, were again dependent on two Prefectures of the Prætorium. It was the lower degrees of this hierarchy which influenced in particular the organisation of the Church. The bishops of the different towns of a province formed a separate group of which the bishop of the civil capital was the head. The ecclesiastical province was a real unity with its local council which assembled frequently and constituted the first, and often the last appeal, in disputed questions. Towards the end of the fourth century there appeared the tendency to group the ecclesiastical provinces in larger unities to correspond with the civil dioceses where the bishop of the capital played naturally an important rôle. Alexandria, Cæsarea in Cappodocia, Ephesus and Constantinople, acquired in this way a privileged position with regard to the lesser cities. A reaction against this tendency made itself felt owing to the traditional claims of

certain sees. Alexandria and Antioch argued their apostolic origins, but Constantinople set aside all claims of tradition. The new Rome, the residence of the Emperor, the seat of the senate, claimed in right of its rank, as Imperial capital, a jurisdiction analogous to that of the great Apostolic Sees. Jerusalem also, in the name of its unique memories, asked not to be subordinated to the metropolis of Cæsarea in Palestine, but to have herself the right to pre-eminence over the other churches. From a number of compromises there sprang finally in the fifth century the division of the East into four patriarchates: those of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and Constantinople. But, as always, the new Rome claimed even greater privileges. The council of 381 had granted to Constantinople pre-eminence *honoris causa*. This honorary title the patriarch of Constantinople tried more and more to transform into a real primacy over the other patriarchates; and this to the great detriment of Catholic unity, which was only safeguarded by the fact that each of the great patriarchates remained directly in communion with the Pope of Rome.

This ecclesiastical hierarchy, in which all the clergy from the patriarch to the lectors were included, was not the only organised force in the Church. We should neglect an important factor if we did not speak of the monks. It was only at the beginning of the fourth century that the monastic idea sprang up. It was marked by the fact that those Christians who desired perfection separated themselves from the bulk of the Christian community, and retired into solitary places, where they formed groups together with others who were of the same mind. The completely isolated hermit was rarely to be found.

Even those most devoted to solitude were not slow in uniting themselves under rules, which, while guaranteeing to each one a certain measure of independence, yet allowed for community life. At a comparatively early date the cenobitical life became the more popular. If in the beginning the deserts of Nitria were the scene of dispersed monastic life, the Thebaïd soon saw regular monastic cities arise under the direction of St Pachomius (388), the true father of the cenobitical life. In Cappodocia St Basil, almost at the same time, gave an impulse to a similar form of life. The rules which bear his name have governed the monks of the East even to our day. Thus conceived, the monastery might draw near to the town; it ended by installing itself within its walls. Constantinople boasted many convents from the fifth century on. Not less celebrated were the monasteries outside the gates of Antioch, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and in Egypt. It would be unjust not to recognise the progress in Christian piety which was due to monasticism, but on the other hand one must acknowledge that in the East it mixed itself up, only too often, in religious disputes; poisoning them by fanaticism, and by a spirit of turbulence, which complicated questions that required to be discussed in perfect calm.

The Origenist Disputes.—The rôle played by the monks is only too evident in those Origenist disputes which formed the interlude between the Trinitarian controversy and the Christological discussions (381-431). Origen, who had died at peace with the Church, and in consequence of tortures courageously borne for the faith, could hardly be

looked upon as a heretic. As an exegete and Biblical critic he had rendered signal service to the Church, but his theology was less reassuring. Opening up new ways of Christian thought, this master had proposed many more problems than he had been able to solve. We have already spoken of the insufficiencies, the dangers that lurked in his doctrines concerning the Trinity. All this was forgotten at the end of the fourth century, but some minds began to be alarmed at certain hypotheses proposed by Origen with regard to the creation of souls, the nature of the resurrection, and especially the final re-establishment of all reasonable beings in perfection (*apocatastasis*).

The most spirited of these adversaries of Origen was St Epiphanius, a Palestinian by origin, and a monk by early training, but later bishop of Salamis on Cyprus. A specialist in matters of heresy, Epiphanius discovered Origenism everywhere. Having combated it with his pen, he undertook to root it out of certain convents in Palestine. After his arrival in Jerusalem in 394 he caused the monastic world to divide into two camps; the one, to which St Jerome rallied, devoted all its energy to pursuing the traces, even the most insignificant, of Origenism; while the other, grouped round the archbishop John and Rufinus, a Latin, who directed a monastery, rival to that of St Jerome, on the Mount of Olives, defended itself with all the means in its power. All this created an impossible state of affairs and led to regrettable polemics between Rufinus and Jerome. Unfortunately the quarrel spread to Egypt.

At that time the archbishop Theophilus governed the Church of Alexandria with a rod of iron.

Possessing an intelligent and agile mind, he knew how to distinguish in Origen what might be held and what should be rejected. At the beginning of the dispute between Epiphanius and John of Jerusalem he had taken the part of the latter. Then suddenly, and for purely personal reasons, he changed face. One of his victims, the archdeacon Isodore, having found refuge with the monks of Nitria, who were favourable to Origen, Theophilus pursued these monks with incredible harshness. Supported by a crowd of other fanatical monks he drove away the Origenists and pronounced a condemnation on the disputed doctrines. Then he addressed an account of the proceedings to Pope Anastasius. The latter, without going into the matter, condemned all that was contrary to Catholic doctrine in Origen. The Pope also signified the decision to the secular power, which was a graver matter, for this latter prohibited all the writings of Origen, as it had formerly forbidden those of Porphyrius and Arius. The Origenist dispute appeared ended, but it was to have an unexpected rebound in Constantinople. From 398 Constantinople had for archbishop John, whose birthplace was Antioch, but who was surnamed by posterity Chrysostom (the Golden Mouth). He was not only an admirable orator, he was also one who knew how to practise the ideals which he upheld. But if John was admired by the people the court found it difficult to pardon his freedom of speech. He was closely watched by Theophilus of Alexandria, who did not wish him well; and a silent combat began between the two great sees of the East. The affair of the monks of Nitria gave the terrible "Pharaoh" a welcome opportunity to interfere,

The victims of Theophilus had taken refuge in Constantinople, and John, without admitting them to ecclesiastical communion, had welcomed them and tried to arrange their affairs. But he did not succeed. On the occasion of a complaint brought by the monks before the Imperial court, it was decided in high places that Theophilus should appear before the archbishop John. Before complying with this order he sent to the capital the aged Epiphanius, who was more violently anti-Origenist than ever. He began preaching against John, accusing him of being favourable to the heresy; but he departed to his island without even having seen John. Theophilus arrived, and profiting by the agitation that reigned, he quickly changed rôles. He had come as one accused; he now posed as accuser and judge. The parody of a synod was assembled under his presidency in a suburb of Chalcedon known by the name of the Oak. John was deposed and an Imperial order banished him from the capital. But Chrysostom was so popular that riots threatened the palace of the emperor. An order was given to bring the archbishop back, but hardly had he resumed his office when hostilities broke out again. On the 20th of June, 404, the archbishop went definitely into exile. Informed by John, Pope Innocent cancelled the judgment passed on him, but, not being able to obtain any reparation, he was obliged to exclude from ecclesiastical communion with Rome, Theophilus of Alexandria, as well as Atticus now raised to the see of Constantinople; and the new archbishop of Antioch, who was a tool of Theophilus. In this way the great sees of the East were separated from the Roman Church. In the meantime the sufferings of

Archbishop John were aggravated. It was decided to relegate him from Cucusus in the ridges of the Taurus, to the frontier of the Empire, to the very foot of the Caucasus. He succumbed on the way on the 14th September, 407.

Twenty-seven years later, January, 434, the body of the great archbishop was brought to Constantinople, and it was only then that the last "Johannites" were reconciled with the general community. But in this quarter of a century how many notable events were to take place. Once again the two sees of Constantinople and Alexandria could be seen in bitter war with each other; once more personal antipathies complicated doctrinal questions, and Imperial intervention increased confusion. But it was no longer on secondary problems that the discussions were brought to bear. It was one of the capital points of Christian doctrine which was called in question. The Christological controversies had begun.

Nestorianism.—The Christological problem is as old as Christianity. In what manner were the divine and human elements, which the Scripture calls upon us to recognise, united in the Person of the Saviour? There was an old heterodox view which had quickly been eliminated, "docetism," which taught that Jesus had possessed only the appearance of human nature, and not its reality. Much more complex was the solution proposed after the middle of the fourth century by Apollinaris of Laodicea. In order to ensure more completely the idea of the unity of the Saviour, this doctor, taking up unwittingly an idea of Arius, attributed to Jesus a body like ours but no rational soul; the place of

the rational soul being taken by the Word of God. According to this theory also, Jesus was human only in appearance. This doctrine had been condemned by Pope Damasus, but a formula was then current in the East, against which many theologians were not sufficiently on their guard. "The nature of the divine Incarnate Word is one," said Apollinaris. The partisans of Apollinaris found a way of inserting this doctrine into spurious documents which they put in circulation at the end of the fourth century, under venerable names such as those of Athanasius, Pope Julian and others.

The other extreme of Christological doctrine was represented by a school of theologians who accentuated as much as possible the distinction between the two elements (soon they would say the two natures) to be recognised in Jesus Christ. This was the school of Antioch, of which the most illustrious representatives during the period of which we are speaking were Deodorus who died as bishop of Tarsus in 304, Theodore, who died as bishop of Mopsuestia in 428, and let us add, St John Chrysostom, taking note, however, that his truly Catholic feeling preserved him from the exaggerations and errors into which the others fell. This Dyophysite school, as it was called, was no doubt right in declaring that in Jesus the two natures, divine and human, existed without intermixture or changing of the one into the other; but this school did not arrive at establishing how the two natures united in forming one being. When Theodore was brought to the point he went so far as to say that two persons, physically independent of each other, should be distinguished: the man Jesus, and the Word of God, who dwelt in Him, that between

these two persons there existed a permanent but exterior bond: from the moment of the Incarnation, the Word inspired, directed and sustained the moral life of the man Jesus. Due allowance being made, this union of the human soul of Christ with the Word might be said to resemble that which is realised when God is present in a special manner in the Christian soul which is in a state of grace. This theology, of which the latter part is clearly erroneous, hardly spread beyond the school; otherwise it would have come into collision with a Roman condemnation forbidding Catholics to speak of "two Sons of God."

Between the veiled "docetism" of Apollinaris and the decidedly too accentuated dualism of the school of Antioch, the theology of the Alexandrines (inherited as a matter of fact from the Cappodocians) tried, not always with success, to find a happy medium. They insisted much on the unity in Christ, as Apollinaris had done; but on the other hand, with the school of Antioch, they admitted that the Saviour had had all that constitutes human nature, only, so they said, all the properties of his human nature were incorporated, so to speak in the hypostases of the Word, in such a manner as to form with it only one *concrete nature*—we should say, one person. And thus they would repeat, without considering its origin, the formula of Apollinaris, "the nature of the divine Incarnate Word is one." There was a distinct risk of sacrificing to Monophysitism—of absorbing and confounding the humanity in the divinity. If the tendency were ever so little accentuated there was danger of representing Christ as not touching the earth at all, ready to fade away into a being that

would have nothing left of human nature but its external appearances.

One sees how difficult the problem was, and certainly it was one that should have been discussed only in the tranquil atmosphere of the world of ideas. But the opposite happened. The conflict between the two schools of Antioch and Alexandria was to find its concrete expression in the conflict between two personages: Nestorius, called from Antioch in 428 to Constantinople by Imperial mandate, and Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus, and his successor to the see of Alexandria. From Antioch where he had grown up, Nestorius brought the theology of which we have spoken, more attenuated as a matter of fact than that of his master Theodore of Mopsuestia. A pursuer of heretics, he determined to purge the capital of the old sects, while at the same time he kept a watchful eye over monastic centres in which there were manifestations of a piety inspired by a theology other than his own. One word in particular seemed to him suspect, that of "Mother of God" (Theotokos), which for some time past it had become usual to give to Mary. Nestorius wished to substitute for it the term "Mother of Christ" (Christotokos) or at least to obtain that the word Theotokos should not be used without explanation. This was a very injudicious suggestion, for the term, besides being already traditional, and dear to devotion, could easily be explained in an obvious and satisfactory manner. No one pretended to make Mary mother of the divinity; people only wanted to say that she was the mother of Jesus, who was God; and they merely attributed to the one and only person of the Word, the properties

of the human as well as of the divine nature. But it was precisely this *communicatio idiomatum in concreto*, which the theology of Antioch, always anxious to attribute the different operations of the Saviour to two distinct subjects, was unwilling to grasp. Nestorius speedily compromised himself; he made certain unfortunate remarks and hazarded dangerous comparisons. It was he himself who was destined to be a heretic. From Alexandria Cyril watched his colleague. He had inherited from his uncle Theophilus not only a taste for the strong manner, but also a certain mistrust of Antioch and Constantinople. Certain rumours reached him of the vagaries of Nestorius. A correspondence, somewhat lacking in urbanity, was exchanged between the two prelates. Threatened with a process at Byzantium where the archbishop had the ear of the court, Cyril warded off the blow by denouncing to Pope Celestine the doctrinal errors of his adversary. Unfavourably impressed with regard to Nestorius, warned by Cyril in a biased manner, annoyed and also surprised at the similarity which one of his theologians, Cassian, remarked between the denounced doctrines and certain adoptional aberrations discovered just at this time in Gaul, the Pope, in a Roman synod of August, 430, condemned the attitude of Nestorius with regard to the Theotokos. The bishop of Constantinople was called upon to retract his errors, and to profess the faith of the Churches of Rome and Alexandria. The communication was addressed, not to Nestorius himself, but to Cyril, commissioned to carry out the decree. This was all very sudden. Nestorius had been condemned without debate, without even a precise statement of the errors for

which he was condemned. Besides, even if the theology of Rome and Alexandria agreed in its broader lines, yet there were considerable shades of difference, as regarded the point then under discussion.

Cyril interpreted the instructions in their most literal sense. Convoking a synod in the autumn of 430 he made it subscribe to the common faith of the Churches of Rome and Alexandria. Unfortunately, if they expressed admirably the Alexandrian theology, the "twelve anathemas" drawn up by Cyril sadly needed certain modifications before they could be said to accord with Roman teaching. . . . Cyril, when all is said and done, formulated for his rival the archbishop, a particular doctrine which was itself open to criticism. By this he finally compromised the whole proceedings. Nestorius, who had heard of the Papal letter through John, archbishop of Antioch, decided without much hesitation to accept, while reserving his explanations, the Theotokos which was up to that time the only disputed term. At this juncture all might have been arranged. But the publication of the "twelve anathemas" which Cyril demanded that Nestorius should sign, renewed the whole problem. The Orientals,[1] suspecting in the doctrine of Cyril a disguised Monophysitism, rose on the side of Nestorius. Andrew of Samosata and Theodoret of Cyrus refuted the anathemas. Nestorius perhaps did likewise, but above all in the midst of this great confusion, he asked the emperor Theodosius II to convoke a council to clear up questions of doctrine and to bring about a reconciliation of persons.

[1] That is to say the bishops of the civil diocese of Orient, of which Antioch was the capital.

The Pope entered into this point of view, and sent legates, which proves implicitly that he considered the first delegation of Cyril as virtually ended.

It was arranged that the council should assemble at Ephesus for Pentecost 431. Cyril went, not without apprehension; his anathemas would surely not meet with the approbation of the Orientals, and unmodified, would hardly find favour with the Romans. But he found that neither the Roman legates nor the Orientals had been able to get to Ephesus for the date fixed. Everything pointed to the necessity of waiting for both parties who might become arbitrators of the quarrel. Cyril decided on the contrary to hasten affairs. In spite of the opposition of the Imperial emissary, Candidian, he declared himself president of the synod, which he convoked for June 22nd. On that day ignoring the protestations of sixty-eight bishops, who wished to wait for the Orientals, and those of Candidian, he summoned Nestorius to appear before the council. Upon his refusal, the assembly, now composed exclusively of partisans of Cyril, excommunicated the absent Nestorius, declared him a heretic, and expressed their approval of the letter concerning dogma, in which Cyril had admonished his adversary at the beginning of the quarrel. The anathemas were read, but no special vote was taken on the subject. At the end of the day the people of Ephesus, to whom the archbishop of Constantinople had been described as a despiser of the Virgin Mary, the Holy Theotokos, gathered in enthusiastic crowds and gave Cyril and his suffragans a great ovation. The triumph of the dogma concerning Mary's maternity is what popular history has retained of

the council of Ephesus, which is counted the third œcumenical council.

In reality matters were very complicated. They became utterly embroiled upon the arrival on the scene, four days too late, of John and his Oriental bishops. With a precipitation more culpable than that of Cyril, these bishops held a *conciliabulum* in a private apartment in their own lodgings, and without further proceedings or public discussion pronounced the deposition of the archbishop of Alexandria and of Memnon of Ephesus, his ally, excommunicating all their adherents who should refuse to condemn the anathemas. In this way the conflict changed ground; it now raged between Alexandria and Antioch, and no longer between Constantinople and Alexandria. The Antiochians, judging that the arguments of Nestorius were not defensible, limited their ambition to obtaining, if not the condemnation of Cyril, at least the explanation and withdrawal of the anathemas. It is difficult to explain briefly all the complicated details of the affair, but what can be noted is the attitude of the Apostolic See and of the court of Constantinople. The Roman legates who had landed at Ephesus a little while after the *coup d'état* of John of Antioch, having ranged themselves on the side of Cyril, had approved the measures of condemnation passed by Cyril against Nestorius and John. Pope Celestine ratified them. Later Pope Sixtus III (432-440), while accepting the acts of Cyril's council, demanded that John of Antioch and his partisans should be re-admitted to the communion of the Church. The court of Constantinople, on the other hand, showed itself much irritated by the action of Cyril, who, however, succeeded in calming this ill humour by conveying an account of his side of

the question to certain high officials. Nestorius, who spoke of retiring into solitude, was taken at his word and sent back to Antioch. The council was at the same time dissolved. Imperial diplomacy now did everything in its power to bring about, in the course of the year 422, a reconciliation between John and Cyril. The first was to abandon Nestorius, and the second to explain his anathemas. This solution was accepted. The archbishop of Alexandria acquiesced in a formula which had been drawn up at Antioch and which spoke explicitly of the union of the two natures. On the other hand the Orientals had to accept the deposition of Nestorius and the condemnation of his doctrine. There was much difficulty in getting Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, to take the necessary steps. In the end, however, he gave in. Abandoned by all, Nestorius was sent to the great Oasis in the heart of the Lybian desert; his books were burnt, and his friends proscribed. They took refuge in Nisibis in Persia. It was here that a little later the Nestorian theology took shape.

Monophysitism.—The agreement between Alexandria and Antioch represented only a short truce. In the years which followed, the Dyophysite school, through the pen of Theodoret, the most learned of the party, defined its position, eliminating certain imprudences of thought, and especially of language. Soon it could count on the support of Flavian, archbishop of Constantinople since 446, and upon Pope Leo, who inaugurated his pontificate in Rome in 440. It is true it had also some compromising allies, among others Ibas of Edessa, author of a letter addressed to the Catholics of Seleucia in 433

just on the eve of the act of union—a letter in which Cyril and his Christology were held up to odium, although in it Nestorius was anathematised. Another dangerous ally was Count Irenæus, who subsequently became bishop of Tyre, and who did not hide his sympathy for the heretic of Ephesus. But in general the Dyophysite school constituted a force with which it was necessary to reckon, and which the Latin West thought fit to support generously as soon as occasion arose.

Monophysitism, on the other hand, was organising itself more and more. In the monastic centres of Constantinople it was the current doctrine. The old archimandrite Eutyches was the best known representative of the movement, being regarded as an oracle by the pious folk of the town, while he was also a favourite at court where his godson Chrysaphius dominated the weak-minded Theodosius. At this time Alexandria became, and for ever, the stronghold of Monophysitism. Cyril, who died in 444, had made the most praiseworthy efforts in his last years to hold the Alexandrians within the limits of orthodoxy. Dioscorus, who succeeded him, being less sure in his theology, and having less strength for resisting this tendency, finally abandoned himself to the current. Closely allied with Eutyches he sought, according to the traditional policy of Alexandria, to check Flavian of Constantinople. The moment was favourable, for the Emperor leaned more and more towards Eutyches and his group. As a consequence of violent polemics a rescript appeared on the 16th February, 448, against all those who in any measure whatever were partisans of Nestorius and who would not accept the anathemas of Cyril. Irenæus had to leave Tyre

immediately; Ibas and Theodoret were threatened in their persons.

The Dyophysites did not lose courage. The aged Eutyches laid himself more and more open to attack. An accusation in due form was deposed against him at the tribunal of the archbishop Flavian. The archimandrite was accused of having denied that Jesus, inasmuch as he was man, was of the same substance as we; for having affirmed that his humanity, entirely penetrated with, and transformed by the divinity, was of another essence than ours, Flavian decided upon action. He obliged Eutyches —not without difficulty—to appear in November, 448. Called upon to profess the Dyophysite faith the veteran refused. He was deposed from his office, deprived of his charge, and Pope Leo was informed of the sentence. Solicited at the same time by Eutyches to annul the judgment of Flavian, the Pope waited to reply until he had received the documents relating to the trial. While he was considering his reply he learnt that the court, in face of the renewed agitation, had decided to call together another council, which was to meet, at Ephesus once more, in August, 449.

Apparently everything tended to make the council a triumph for Eutyches. Theodoret was set aside, Dioscorus appointed president, and one of the most ardent Monophysites, the archimandrite Barsumas, was to represent the monks of the Orient who accompanied him in great numbers to Ephesus. Pope Leo, who had also been invited, excused himself, but he sent legates, bearers, among other things, of an important dogmatic epistle addressed to the archbishop of Constantinople. This "Epistle to Flavian," an admirable piece of theology, resumed with legal precision the doctrine of the two natures in

the unity of one person. Not less significant was the letter addressed to the council, in which Leo, claiming the doctrinal prerogative of the Apostolic See, traced for the assembly its plan of work.

There was but little question of all this. It was not the Pope of Rome who counted at Ephesus, but the "Pharaoh" of Alexandria, supported by his faithful Egyptians, and by the bands of fanatical monks, who had hastened from Constantinople at the call of Eutyches, and from Syria at the call of Barsumas. Dioscorus took the presidential chair; the Roman legates lost their heads, and were not able to direct the debate, nor even to withdraw at the right moment. The council began by rehabilitating Eutyches: his profession of faith, "Two natures before the union, one nature after," which had been clearly reprobated in the "Epistle to Flavian," was approved. Then, having recourse again to proceedings which had already been successful, Dioscorus made himself the accuser of Flavian. Murmurs broke out, whereupon he called in the military. Flavian was torn violently away from the altar to which he clung in self-defence; then under pressure of a host of monks, who had followed on the heels of the soldiers, Dioscorus exacted a vote of assent. All present gave it, including Domnus, the patriarch of Antioch, the natural head of the Oriental party, and the born protector of Dyophysite theology. He profited little by this cowardice. Fifteen days later, in a new meeting, proceedings were taken against the heads of the party: Irenæus, Ibas, Theodoret, and Domnus himself, were deposed. Then the synod solemnly proclaimed the anathemas of Cyril.

Already in October the Pope was informed of the

matter and in a Roman synod protested against the *latrocinium Ephesinum* (the brigandage of Ephesus). His protest was in vain, for just at the same moment an Imperial decree approved all the measures of Dioscorus. Monophysitism was triumphant. But it was not for long. On the 28th of July Theodosius died: his sister Pulcheria was proclaimed empress and married Marcianus, who by this fact became emperor. Chrisaphius, the protector of Eutyches, implicated in a case of high treason, was executed. Singular change! Pope Leo was asked to send legates to a new council, which was designed to clear up once and for all the theology of the Incarnation. The assembly was held in the autumn of 451 at Chalcedon near Constantinople, on the Asiatic bank of the Bosphorus, within reach of the Imperial authority, determined this time to prevent scenes of violence. Leo ended by agreeing to these conditions. Under the presidency of his legates and in the presence of Imperial functionaries charged with maintaining order, the council was opened on the 8th of October, 451. It is counted as the fourth œcumenical council. It commenced by the case of Dioscorus who was deposed. But the real matter of importance was the doctrinal question. On the 10th October the "Epistle to Flavian" was accepted with acclamations: "Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo." Something more explicit, however, was desired; and a commission, in which representatives of the two tendencies, of Antioch and of Alexandria, worked hand in hand, was charged to elaborate a definition of faith regarding the disputed doctrine. It defined the belief in "Jesus Christ, consubstantial with the Father according to His Divinity, and consubstantial with us according

to His humanity, born of the Virgin, Mother of God, according to His humanity, Son, Lord, in two natures without intermixture, without change, without division or separation. . . each nature keeping its properties, both existing in one Person, one only hypostasis." This profession of faith was acclaimed. On the 25th October the Emperor solemnly promulgated it. Six hundred names of those who assented may be read in the acts of the assembly. It only remained to reinstate the victims of "the Robber Synod." In the case of Theodoret it was done, but he was obliged, once more, to anathematise Nestorius. The affair of Ibas was more difficult; his epistle on the anathemas of St Cyril had been harsh in the extreme, and the council wished to respect the doctrine of the patriarch of Alexandria. Finally the legates, after the reading of the disputed text, judged its author to be orthodox, and he too was rehabilitated. The last sittings of the council were devoted to disciplinary and administrative questions. It was then that the Eastern patriarchates were definitely organised, notably that of Jerusalem which was now separated from the jurisdiction of Antioch, and that of Constantinople to which was added a new province, the civil dioceses of Thrace, of Pontus, and of Asia Proconsularis; while at the same time the right to pre-eminence of the see of Constantinople, already affirmed in 381, was again formally recognised. This last innovation was pregnant of consequences, of which the Roman legates vaguely perceived the danger. At a given moment it was even to be feared that this canon 28 would hinder Pope Leo from recognising the whole work of the council. The Imperial government was obliged to interpose. Leo finally yielded, and

explicitly ratified the council in all its dogmatic decisions.

Thus the doctrine of the Incarnation was in the end established at the cost of struggles which had made many victims. Rome finally steered a middle course between the Antiochian and Alexandrian tendencies. From the former it took over the clear distinction between the two natures in Jesus; of the teaching of the latter it retained the assertion of the indivisible unity of the Saviour; condemning the exaggerations of both schools, the imprudent language of a Nestorius which betrayed the error of his Christology, as well as the almost equally dangerous excesses of a Eutyches or a Dioscorus. As regards St Cyril, Rome refused to accept the anathemas otherwise than on the condition of their being explained. It remained to be seen whether the Epistle of Leo and the definitions of Chalcedon, the fruit of Roman wisdom, would succeed in re-establishing the unity of the Eastern Church which had been so gravely imperilled by twenty years of painful agitation.

CHAPTER V

THE ORIENTAL SCHISMS AND THE EFFORTS TOWARDS REUNION (SIXTH AND SEVENTH CENTURIES)

The Nestorian Church—The anti-Chalcedon Agitation—The Henotikon of Zeno—The Quarrel of the Three Chapters—Monothelitism.

FAR from bringing about union, the council of Chalcedon proved the starting-point of lasting separations, which were destined to give to the map of the Christian East the motley character that it still has. It is not that efforts were not made, in the two centuries that followed Chalcedon, to reduce these differences; too much inspired by politics, and with too little regard for principle, they only tended to increase friction and to solidify separatism.

The Nestorian Churches.—We must first follow within the Persian Empire the definite establishment of the Nestorian church, which was to become the national church, so to speak, of this region, the most remote that Christianity had yet reached in the direction of the East. It was especially during the second half of the fourth century that the new religion took firm root in the new Sassanide Empire.

The bishop of the royal residence of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the "catholicos" as he was called, had soon become the head of an ecclesiastical organisation, which extended over the whole of Persia, and little by little gained the western coast of India. It was in Mesopotamia in particular, in Chaldea, in Susis and Iran, that the Christians were first numerous and flourishing. Even in the northern region bounded by Armenia, the Christians, at the beginning of the fourth century, probably formed the majority of the population. This development had taken place in spite of the habitual hostility of the civil power, and in spite of very rude persecutions which marked the end of the fourth century. In 410, however, the Persian church had also its "Edict of Milan," and enjoyed, if not official protection, a sufficient tolerance; disturbed, it is true, from time to time by returns to active persecution. The Sassanide dynasty never embraced Christianity; in fact they looked upon the gospel as a national danger because it was the bond which united Persian subjects with the Roman Empire, with which the Sassanides were so often at war. Nevertheless communication remained in normal times possible between the Persian Christians and Antioch. It is easy to understand how the Dyophysite doctrine was the only one spread in the realm of the "king of kings." The masters of the Persian church were Deodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret. As no political authority had ever compelled this church to anathematise Nestorius, it became, almost without knowing it, Nestorian. It is by mistake that the bishop of Nisibis, Barsumas (not to be confounded with the famous archimandrite), is represented as having introduced and propagated

Nestorianism in Persia. It is true that Barsumas brought to Nisibis, his episcopal town, the celebrated Persia school which had been installed at Edessa, after the disastrous advent of the emperor Julian in 361, and had been expelled from this town a hundred years later by the successor of Ibas, who had condemned it as imbued with the spirit of Nestorianism. By its translation of the great masters of Antioch, Nestorius included, this school contributed much to the creation of what is commonly called the Nestorian theology. This was calculated to isolate more and more the church in Persia from the rest of Christendom; especially later on, when the great Jacobite (or Monophysite) church of which we are about to study the rise and progress in Syria, came to be placed between the Persian and orthodox churches. There came a time when Persian Christianity was considered by all, Jacobites as well as Melchites, to be heretical and schismatical. Then Mohammedanism was to come and render more than precarious the fate of the Christians in the plains of Mesopotamia, on the plateaux of Iran, and round the shores of the Persian Gulf. The Persian church did not even preserve the memory of its glorious history.

While the church of Persia thus detached itself without any particular shock from Catholic unity, the Copt and Jacobite churches were, by means of violent agitation, set up in opposition to the State church (Melchite, that is Imperial). These churches became the refuge of many of the formulæ of Monophysite theology, as well as of the national aspirations of the different peoples in revolt against Byzantine rule. As a matter of fact, the intrigues against the theology of Chalcedon sought much less to hold in check the doctrine of " two natures in Christ " than to eliminate

all traces of Hellenic culture, and to throw off the yoke which the Roman Empire had imposed upon peoples of a different culture. It is this aspect of the religious quarrels of the sixth and seventh centuries which justifies the importance generally given them in history. To give any account of them is to explain the progressive disintegration of the Byzantine Empire.

The Anti-Chalcedon Agitation and the Henotikon (Edict of Union) of Zeno.—In Palestine, in Cappodocia, even in Constantinople itself, the anti-Chalcedon agitation, progagated chiefly by the monks, broke out even before the return from the council of the bishops who were accused of having there betrayed the cause of Cyril. In many places, especially in Jerusalem, the prelates could not reinstate themselves without the aid of the troops. Violent resistance was shown particularly in two places, at Alexandria, which is not surprising, but also at Antioch, which appears most extraordinary.

In the capital of Egypt, the stronghold of Monophysitism, the " cursed council " was blamed for the deposition of Dioscorus, who died soon after (454) in his exile at Gangres. In vain did his successor Proterius, appointed by the government, try to disarm the opposition. It only increased, carefully supported by two men, the priest Timotheus Aeluros, and the deacon Peter Mongus. The emperor Marcian died in the last days of January, 457, and there were reasons for believing that his successor, Leo (457-474), would not show any particular loyalty with regard to the council. On the 16th of March a rising broke out in Alexandria, Proterius was massacred, and throughout Egypt all the bishops

who favoured the council were deposed and replaced. The government, however indifferent to the cause of orthodoxy, could not remain inactive in the face of such events. Timotheus Aeluros, who without any formality had established himself in the patriarchal see, was expelled by force (*manu militari*). For the moment the law triumphed, and with the protection of Byzantine arms, the Chalcedonian, Timotheus Salofaciolus—one of the best of men—was able to maintain his authority for fifteen years.

Strange to say, in Antioch, the citadel of Dyophysitism, an analogous course of events took place. A priest, Peter Fullo, from the monastery of the Acoimeti in Constantinople, organised in the capital of Syria the Monophysite opposition against the patriarch Martyrius, and ended by supplanting him. Martyrius was re-established by Imperial order, but, worn out by the ill-treatment of which he became the victim, he finally resigned. Peter again assumed his place in the vacant see. A new order came from Constantinople to get rid of the agitator. He was interned in a convent in the capital until 475, when he was to find an opportunity of revenging himself.

The Imperial court itself was also the scene of strange upheavals. The emperor Leo, who had in general respected the decisions of Chalcedon, was overthrown the following year by Basiliscus (475-477). His advent marked the triumph of the anti-Chalcedonians. Aeluros had a triumphant entry into Alexandria, and Peter Fullo established himself once more in the see of Antioch. Soon an Imperial encyclical appeared which canonised the two councils of Ephesus, 431 and 440, and anathematised the "Epistle of Leo" and the creed of Chalcedon, rejecting at the same time the specific errors of Eutyches.

Under Imperial constraint the whole Byzantine episcopate subscribed to this encyclical.

One man, however, had the courage to resist, Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople. The following year Basiliscus was defeated, and Zeno, the victor, took up the reins of government. Acacius became his counsellor. The first thought of both was to re-establish the decisions of Chalcedon. The Byzantine episcopate withdrew their signatures to the encyclical of Basiliscus. At Alexandria Timotheus Salofaciolus returned to his see, Aeluros having died, while at Antioch Peter Fullo was once more obliged to disappear. But, if it was relatively easy to impose signatures and to get rid of persons who were too much compromised, it was much more difficult to quell the rising agitation. Acacius consequently conceived towards 480 the idea of obtaining religious peace at the cost of certain concessions. Even if the Apostolic See were to show ill humour, was it not worth while to relinquish the indefensible council in order to come to an understanding with the intransigent Cyrillians? Instead of supporting the Chalcedonian prelates in the great sees, would it not be wiser to recognise the intruders or schismatics of yesterday who might become the lawful bishops of to-morrow? In Alexandria in particular, Peter Mongus maintained his position in the face of the Imperial patriarch Salofaciolus. It would be best to let the latter die in peace but to make no effort to replace him. In this way Mongus might become, by means of certain concessions, the legitimate successor to the see of Cyril and of Dioscorus.

An Edict of Union (Henotikon), inspired by these principles, was consequently published in 482. The

Emperor, addressing himself to the bishops, clergy and people of Alexandria, declared that he would recognise no other creed than that of Nicæa. He accepted, nevertheless, all that had been decided at Ephesus against Nestorius and his adherents. He also anathematised Eutyches, but accepted the anathemas of Cyril. Whoever had thought otherwise, whether at Chalcedon or at any other synod, was to be condemned. This document is a triumph of reticence: on the only disputed point (one or two natures in Jesus Christ) the Imperial document is silent. Without being heterodox the Henotikon signified the relinquishment of Chalcedon. It was intended to be an act of union; in reality it created more schism.

Rome did not resign itself to this state of things. Pope Simplicius (468-483) had insisted in his letters upon the impossibility of his recognising Mongus as patriarch of Alexandria. His successor, Felix III (483-492), in a Roman synod of July, 484, found himself obliged to excommunicate not only Mongus but also Acacius, as his accomplice. The patriarch of Constantinople replied by having the name of the Pope erased from the diptychs. The schism was complete between the old and the new Rome. It lasted more than thirty years. Did it lead at last to union in the East? Alas! no. The Monophysites found the Henotikon insufficient; what they wanted was the rehabilitation of "Saint Dioscorus," the condemnation of Chalcedon, and an anathema against all those whom the council had declared innocent.

At Alexandria, Peter Mongus could no longer appease his former partisans; the Monophysite monks (and their name was legion) did not want to have anything more to say to him because he remained in

communion with Acacius and the other Chalcedonians. At Antioch Peter Fullo occupied once more the patriarchal see. If in his triumph he met with fewer crosses and accidents than his colleague of Alexandria, and was allowed to die in peace in 488, he had the mortification of seeing that his followers would be obliged to go much further than he had done in the ways of Monophysitism. In 510 a man mounted the patriarchal throne who was to give the party a definite doctrine. His name was Severus; born in Pisidia, he had been educated at Alexandria in monastic centres, and was devoted to the veneration of Dioscorus and Cyril. A man of wide culture and great distinction of intellect, he was to become the indefatigable champion of a mitigated Monophysitism. Very removed from the extremes of Eutyches, desiring only the triumph of the anathemas of Cyril, he yet reclaimed loudly the rejection of Chalcedon. Severus defended this middle position, not only against the orthodox, but also against the fanatics, or extremists of his own party. Not being able to improve upon its severities, he kept for the time being to the terms of the Henotikon, but from the moment when he saw that the Henotikon was threatened, he did not hesitate, in spite of his moderation, to separate from Constantinople. At Antioch, as at Alexandria, everything was preparing for a definite schism.

At the beginning of the sixth century there was as yet no question of this schism. The emperor Zeno, the author of the Henotikon, remained, until his death in 491, faithful to the religious policy of Acacius. The emperor Anastasius (491-518) definitely favoured Monophysitism, which, of course, was absolutely triumphant in Alexandria and in Antioch.

The united attempts of two successive patriarchs to break off compromising relations only ended in their being deposed. Powerless to interfere, Rome witnessed in remote isolation this triumph of the anti-Chalcedon reaction.

The emperor Anastasius was the first to solicit, for political reasons, a reconciliation with Rome. The first overtures failed. Pope Hormisdas (514-523), a man of precise doctrine and firm character, would not renew relations with the East except on condition that the traditional rights of Rome sovereignly to define matters of doctrinal controversy should be recognised; further, that the decisions of Ephesus and Chalcedon should be acknowledged as rules of faith, that the Epistle of Leo should be accepted, and the Monophysites Aeluros, Mongus, and Acacius condemned. This was an ultimatum, and Anastasius would not accept it. The negotiations remained temporarily suspended. In 578 Anastasius died and conditions changed. Justin, the new emperor, and Justinian his nephew—soon to be associated in power while waiting till 527 to succeed his uncle—had to give in to public opinion, which at Constantinople claimed more clearly a union with Rome and respect for the decisions of Chalcedon. An Imperial decree ordered the re-establishment of the bishops exiled by Anastasius, while Severus of Antioch was deposed and fled to Alexandria. All things being thus prepared, there was nothing to be done but to turn to Rome. Hormisdas yielded to the Imperial wishes, but without haste and without ceding one of the points that he had previously exacted. In Constantinople and the provinces subject to this see, religious peace was comparatively easy to re-establish, and the Acacian schism was

brought to an end at Easter, 519. It was more difficult to bring about peace in the other patriarchates. At Alexandria, for instance, it was out of the question to get rid of the patriarch Timothy III, who was an open Monophysite. At Antioch the successive attempts made to replace the fugitive Severus were unfortunate. Insurmountable difficulties continued in Syria and Egypt. The secular arm, however, worked so efficiently, that except in these two provinces, submission was general. About the years 520-525 it looked as if the East, considered at least collectively, had returned to the faith of Chalcedon.

Justinian and the Three Chapters.—This apparent unity was deceptive. In reality the separatist tendencies were working more than ever in the infected provinces. In Syria, as at the mouth of the Nile, the opposition silently crystallised. More and more the church of Egypt separated itself from all that was Greek in thought and language, and more and more in all the acts of the religious life, the popular Copt dialect replaced Greek, the language of the cultured, which was confined to Byzantine functionaries. A similar phenomenon was to manifest itself a little later in Syria, where as an ecclesiastical language, Greek gave way little by little before the inroads of Syriac. Religious controversy alternately drew strength from racial separatism, and contributed itself to nourish this latter. For a moment the vigorous policy of Justin, and that of the first five years of Justinian's reign, deprived these dissidents of their leaders. Gathered together at Constantinople under the eye of the Imperial police, or forced to hide themselves, they

appeared for a time deprived of activity, until a man appeared who was to give new life to the Monophysite churches of Syria and Egypt. This was James Baradai, a Syrian monk, who in 543 was consecrated bishop at Constantinople by the anti-Chalcedon patriarch of Alexandria. James was entrusted with the jurisdiction of Anatolia and Syria. From this time he devoted himself to the restoration of the disorganised cause of Monophysitism. Disguised as a mendicant (hence his name: Baradai = the ragged) he traversed untiringly the parts of the country where anti-Chalcedon suffrage might be obtained, reorganising the dispersed churches, ordaining priests and bishops, travelling about Syria and Egypt with incredible rapidity, evading the pursuit of the police. In his wake Monophysitism sprang up renewed, and a new church was formed in Syria which was to bear the name of James, Jacobite, as opposed to Melchite or Imperial, the official church which was dependent on the "Basileus."

Justinian (527-566).—Justinian anxiously watched the progress of these disintegrating tendencies. His foreign policy had met with success. In the West the Roman world was beginning once more to get the better of the Barbarians. Byzantine armies had just recovered Africa from the Vandals (534). From their palace in Ravenna the Arian kings of the Ostrogoths of Italy, Theoderic (died 526) and his successor Theodatus, followed with apprehension the advance of Byzantine influence. Twice the Roman popes, first John I (523-526) and then Agapetus (535-536), might be seen disembarking at the Golden Horn as ambassadors, sent by the Arian masters of Italy

to the Basileus. But the conquest of the peninsula was not prevented by these embassies. It proved more difficult than that of Vandal Africa. Belisarius entered Rome on the 10th October, 536, but it would require another twenty years solidly to establish Byzantine supremacy in Italy. While Byzantine influence was thus being reconstituted in the West, the East itself, for religious reasons, appeared to be escaping from it. Surely, even if orthodoxy were to suffer weakening, it would be better to disarm the threatening spirit of particularism by some opportune concessions.

The temptation was the greater because the Imperial palace prided itself upon its theology. The empress Theodora made no secret of her preference for Monophysitism, and it was round Theodora that the anti-Chalcedonians, living under police supervision at Constantinople, grouped themselves. The intrigues of this group succeeded in 536 in raising to the see of the capital, Anthimus, formerly bishop of Trebizond, who was of anti-Chalcedon tendencies. The moment was badly chosen. Agapetus had just arrived in Constantinople; he refused to recognise Anthimus, whom Justinian had to abandon. In the middle of the transaction Agapetus died at Constantinople.

The old Rome having been reconquered by Byzantine arms, Justinian conceived the idea of using Byzantine influence to have a pope elected who would be less opposed to ideas of reconciliation. This plan was carried out, and Theodora's choice fell upon a young man whose moral worth she had been able to gauge. His name was Vigilius, and he had resided since 532 in Constantinople as an ambassador (Apocrisiarius) of the Pope. He was certainly

ambitious, and already under the pontificate of Boniface II (530-532) he had tried to get this Pope to nominate him his successor. The matter had got noised about, and Boniface had been obliged to burn publicly the secret document which had been drawn up. But in spite of this the Apocrisiarius had not given up his dream. Immediately after the death of Agapetus he departed for Rome, carrying with him a letter from Theodora to Belisarius, commanding the latter to use all his influence to bring about the election of Vigilius. The favourite arrived in Rome too late. Sylverius had been already elected. But some months later Sylverius was accused of high treason and deposed by the general. Vigilius took his place (537-555).

Such a past, it would seem, ought to have prepared the new Pontiff to make the most ample concessions. We need not insist upon the attitude which he took in 543 when the order came to him from Constantinople to ratify immediately the condemnation passed by Justinian himself on the Origenist doctrines. This matter was ancient history, and the Emperor's command would not have been of any importance if it had not shown how, in matters of dogma, the Basileus was encroaching more and more upon the domain of the Pope. Ten years later another similar order was transmitted to Vigilius. It related to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and it was to inaugurate for the poor Pope a series of painful conflicts, and also for both East and West a renewal of religious quarrels.

Under the name of the "Three Chapters" were designated certain writings of three personages who had died long before: Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa. The work

of the first was certainly indefensible; his Christology was pure Nestorianism. Theodoret, on the contrary, had died before the council of Ephesus, and at peace with the Church. In his own day no one had thought of condemning him. Ibas and Theodoret had been mixed up in the violent debates of the years 431-461, because as decided Antiochians they had attacked Cyril. Condemned by the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus, they had been explicitly rehabilitated at Chalcedon, but only, let it be said, after they had anathematised Nestorius. Both died at peace with the Church. Theodoret left, and justly, the reputation of an apostle and saint.

But then the attitude of the council of Chalcedon with regard to these two men was the sore point which the Monophysites treasured up against the "cursed synod." It was an old question, but in 538 some conferences held at Constantinople had shown to Justinian that, if these three names were sacrificed, the more moderate among the Monophysites might be gained for the creed of Chalcedon. This idea bore fruit; in 544 a decree of the Basileus pronounced the condemnation of the Three Chapters, "All due reverence being shown with regard to the Epistle of Leo." The East was accustomed to these brutal interventions, and the East submitted; nevertheless, the patriarch of Constantinople, Mennas, only gave his signature under the condition that Rome should express assent.

What was Vigilius to do? The question was in itself sufficiently difficult. It would have been easy enough to condemn the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and without doubt there might be found also in Ibas and Theodoret more than one phrase that lent itself to discussion; but on the other hand

the solemn rehabilitation of their persons at Chalcedon, after the reading of their most disputed works, was also a matter to be seriously considered. To subscribe against a thing already judged, and in the absence of any new fact, was an attack upon the authority of the council and on that of Leo, who had explicitly approved the dogmatic decisions of this council. Besides, what would the West say, the West of whose doctrine Chalcedon was the expression?

It was impossible for the unhappy Vigilius to escape. In November, 544, Belisarius shipped him off to Constantinople. After a long delay in Sicily, the Pope arrived in the capital in January. Although the reception given him was splendid, he was, as a matter of fact, the prisoner of the Emperor. Vigilius had not the soul of a martyr. On the 11th of April, after lengthy and obscure negotiations, he signed a "Judicatum," in which he condemned the Three Chapters. The entire West protested violently. A Council of Africa in 559 excommunicated Vigilius, and in this reconquered province nothing could checkmate the resistance of the champions of Chalcedon. Similar bitter opposition made itself felt in the North of Italy. The court growing alarmed, gave Vigilius back his "Judicatum" and spoke of convoking a great council, where the Pope—at least so he promised—would maintain his condemnation of the disputed chapters. At last, when everything threatened to become hopelessly confused, Justinian in 551 decided to take matters into his own hands, and himself issued a condemnation of the Three Chapters.

This time Vigilius recovered his courage. He declared that no matter what attempts should be

made at coercion he would not appear at the council, which by another sudden change of policy the Emperor had decided to assemble as speedily as possible. It met in May, 553, without the Pope. On the 14th of May Vigilius launched a "Constitutum" which does him great honour. He denied all participation in the doctrine and spirit of Theodore, from whose works sixty propositions were examined and condemned; but with regard to the person of the bishop of Mopsuestia he refused to anathematise him, and forbade anyone to do so. The dead were not to be judged. With regard to Ibas and Theodoret, whose case was simpler, the Pope held to what had been decreed at Chalcedon.

The Imperial council, in spite of this, continued its work of examining the Three Chapters. On the 2nd of June the proceedings were terminated, and it promulgated a series of anathemas. Some which were anti-Nestorian were approved by all; others merely renewed the old condemnations, especially that of Origen; the last of the series touched Theodore of Mopsuestia, his person and his works, the writings of Theodoret against the council of Ephesus, Cyril and his anathemas, and finally the letter of Ibas. All this was contrary to the decisions of Vigilius, but an Imperial decree proclaimed it a law of the State, and imposed upon the bishops the duty of signing the anathemas of the council. The East yielded once more. Abandoned by his clergy, tired of a struggle without result, undermined by the malady which was to carry him off, the unhappy Vigilius surrendered in his turn. On the 23rd of February, 554, "on being better informed," as he said, he drew up a second "Constitutum," explicitly annulling all his former decisions and condemning

the Three Chapters. In this way the council of Constantinople became the fifth œcumenical council. It was only then that Vigilius received permission to return to Rome, but he never arrived there. He died at Syracuse on the 7th of June, 555. Pelagius, his deacon, who was appointed his successor, understanding that any other course was hardly possible, read on the day of his consecration a carefully composed profession of faith which, as regarded the Byzantine court, was equivalent to an indirect recognition of the fifth council, but which also affirmed for the benefit of the anxious West, his attachment to the other four councils (Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon), and his veneration for the memory of Ibas and Theodoret. The Western bishops, too much on the alert to subscribe to the definitions of the fifth council, were not called upon to give their signatures. Schisms, nevertheless, did not cease to threaten. In Africa the heavy hand of Byzantine law got the better of these, but it was more difficult to overcome the resistance in northern Italy which the Lombards were invading. Gaul remained frankly suspicious.

In short, in the affair of the Three Chapters, the Apostolic See had, in consequence of the Byzantine exactions, lost something of its prestige.

Monothelitism.—The question was whether these sacrifices had at least sufficed to stem the advancing current of separatism in the East. Alas! this was more than doubtful. Neither in Egypt nor Syria was the union with Byzance restored, and in both these regions the Melchite church tended to become more and more isolated in the midst of populations which were indifferent or hostile. At Alexandria

as at Antioch a new dissenting hierarchy was erected in opposition to the Melchite patriarch, supported by the Byzantine authorities. It was hardly a time of calm. The Coptic church was ravaged by internal strife, engendered no less by abstruse doctrinal questions, than by irritating questions relating to persons. A still graver matter was the long and tenacious rivalry which broke out between the Monophysite churches of Syria and Egypt, and which lasted more than forty years (575-616). A reconciliation took place, however, between these two enemies in the year 616. It is possible that this reconstitution of the Monophysite block alarmed the emperor Heraclius (610-641). It is also possible that in the midst of the immense danger, caused suddenly at the beginning of the seventh century by the ambition of Persia, he sought to reorganise the Christians of the Empire. Perhaps the two motives acted simultaneously on his mind. At any rate he decided to try to find a new formula which would be acceptable to Chalcedonians and Monophysites alike.

For two centuries the conceptions of Nature and Person had now been disputed. It was said at Chalcedon that since the Incarnation there exist in Jesus two natures, to which the adversaries of Chalcedon replied that even if Christ be really of two natures, we must, after the union of the two, speak only of one nature, one hypostasis, as we speak of one person. The question was a very subtle one. A nature, in truth, manifests itself outwardly by its activity, its operations; thus the problem takes another aspect. Are we to distinguish in Jesus two sorts of activity, the one divine, the other human, or would it not be better to speak of only one activity, one divine-human operation (*theandriké*)?

Those who were, either professedly or otherwise, Monophysite, took hold of the second of these formulæ. Under cover of specious reasoning they even strove to impose it upon certain Chalcedonians, who allowed themselves to be taken by surprise, and some of whom imagined that they might be sacrificing the perfect unity of the Man God in affirming that Christ possessed two wills, one divine, the other human. The moment seemed opportune for certain persons to insinuate themselves into the Imperial councils, and to suggest to the Basileus that a formula, expressing the unity of energy in Jesus, might have a chance of reconciling Christians of all denominations. One man strongly supported this idea, Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, who was to be installed in 631 in the Melchite see of Alexandria. According to his own testimony he worked wonders in Alexandria. The Copts returned in crowds to the State church. But the very way in which they hastened to submit might have aroused suspicion. "We did not go to Chalcedon," they said, "but Chalcedon has come to us."

At Constantinople the patriarch Sergius showed himself less enthusiastic; still he gave adherence to a formula which he must have recognised as compromising, the more so as the formal warnings reached him from Palestine, which had been recently reconquered from Chosroes. A celebrated abbot, Sophronius, who was soon to be raised to the see of Jerusalem, was disputing vigorously with his neighbour of Alexandria. Tired out at last, he referred the matter to Sergius. The step was thus forced upon the patriarch of Constantinople which was to solve the difficulty: he had recourse to the Pope of Rome.

The throne of Peter was at that time occupied by Honorius (625-688). This energetic Pope, who was a capable administrator, carried on not ingloriously the policy of his predecessor, St Gregory the Great (570-604). But his attitude with regard to the Byzantine emperor whose subject he was, though dignified in general, was slightly tinged with obsequiousness. Above all he was wanting in that theological scholarship which had become rare in the West, and the secret of which seemed to have perished with Gregory the Great and his celebrated contemporary Isodore of Seville. The question posed by Sergius was one which called for a certain practice in theological niceties. The patriarch insinuated to the Pope that the wisest course would be to impose silence on both parties, and so avoid any pronouncement upon the unity or duality of the operations. He urged that it would in any case be well to insist upon the fact that it is the same Christ who performs actions both human and divine, and that in consequence it would be better to speak of only one will in Christ. Honorius, not suspecting any malice, entered into the view of the Byzantine patriarch. His reply, copied from the request of Sergius, prescribed silence on the subject of the unity or duality of the operations; it recognised, it is true—following the lines of the Epistle of Leo—that each of the two natures acted in the way proper to it; but finally, obsessed no doubt by the desire to avoid all suspicion with regard to discord in the soul of the Saviour, the Pope exacted a belief in the "one will of the Saviour Jesus." The explanations which followed were hardly of a kind to improve the unhappy formula. The thought of Honorius was surely orthodox, but

what pledges were not given to the adherents of the theory of oneness of operation and will by the phrasing of his letter!

Constantinople was delighted. Supported by Sergius, persuaded perhaps that the Pope was in accord with him, the Emperor launched in 638 an "Ekthesis" (exposition of faith) which apparently concerned itself merely with the enactment of the pontifical letter. The "Ekthesis" forbade the use of the terms "one energy" or "two energies," because both one and the other might, according to the case in question, be applied in a heretical sense; but it declared, on the other hand, that it admitted only one will in Christ. In Rome people were thunderstruck. Honorius had died without having known the "Ekthesis" or the formidable complications which it would create. His successor Severinus reigned only a few months, but John IV (640-642) did not hesitate to condemn Monothelitism, protesting against the use that had been made of the name of Pope Honorius. Once more the struggle broke out between Rome, strong with the support of the West, and Constantinople growing more and more obdurate. Nothing would make Rome cede, although from the temporal point of view she remained under Byzantine rule. The emperor Constans II (642-648) might publish in 648 a dogmatic edict called the "Typus," prohibiting the discussion of one or two wills. Pope Martin I at a Lateran synod of 649 proclaimed the dogma of the two wills, condemning the authors and makers of the heresy, and dared to attack the "most impious Ekthesis" and the "criminal Typus," and had the courage to communicate the sentence to the Emperor himself and to all Christendom. This heroic audacity

brought its own punishment. On the 15th of June, 653, the Pope was abducted from Rome and brought to Constantinople. He was condemned to death for the crime of high treason, and after a mock execution was shipped to the Crimea, where he died in 655. Another defender of orthodoxy, the abbot Maximus, was subjected some time later to most cruel torture.

It was hardly the moment for the Christians to fall upon one another. The great storm which for some years had been gathering in Arabia burst suddenly over the East. Mohammed had died in 632. Abou Bekir had undertaken to gain the whole world to Islam. Pouring out of Arabia, the Musulman armies had taken Syria in the rear and carried Damascus by storm in 634. After this they divided; one half going north, after having taken Antioch, attacked the Persian Empire. The other turned to the south. Jerusalem was taken in 638. After this it was Egypt's turn. In 640 Alexandria yielded to Amrou, and soon the first scouts turned their steps towards Maghreb. About 660 the movement was slightly arrested, the Arabs themselves not being free from internal dissensions; but the advent of the Ommiad dynasty in Damascus was to lend to Islam a renewed activity. In 672 an Arab army laid siege unsuccessfully to Constantinople. While the Byzantine East became thus dislocated, the Lombards in Italy succeeded in making still more precarious the rule of the Basileus.

It was necessary to secure a union among the Christians at any price. This was now an easy matter, as it was no longer necessary to take into account the two Monophysite churches, separated now and for ever from the Byzantine Empire by the Arab conquests. All this was understood at once

in Rome, where an effort was made, on the occasion of a visit paid by Constans, to avoid any delicate questions. Somewhat later it was also understood in Byzance during the reign of Constantine Pagonatus (668-685). Pope Agatho (678-681) finally received an Imperial letter inviting him to take part in a great council, designed to establish union between the East and West. As the Basileus had really given up the "Ekthesis" and the "Typus," it only remained to pronounce the official condemnation of the heretical doctrines and of those who had favoured them. On the 7th of November, 680, a council opened in the capital, which bears the name of the sixth œcumenical council or the Trullanium I. The large majority of those who attended were Easterns. The West was represented by two delegations, the one sent by Pope Agatho, the other composed of three bishops sent especially by the Roman synod of 679 which had again condemned Monothelitism and its authors. These Westerns, not being *au courant* with affairs in Byzance, flattered themselves that the assembly would confine itself to ratifying the decisions of the Roman synod. This, in the matter of persons, had limited itself to proscribing the names of the authors and first abettors of the heresy, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius of Constantinople, and the successors of this latter. Care was taken not to breathe a word of Pope Honorius. On the banks of the Bosphorus the same consideration was not shown. The sacrosanct person of the Basileus could not be attacked, but the men who were ready to condemn Monothelitism were determined to include among the number of those responsible for the heresy the Pope of the old Rome who had imprudently let himself be duped by

the machinations of Sergius and Heraclius. The memory of Honorius could not be safeguarded, and the inevitable occurred. At the meeting of the 28th of March, 581, after having rejected the heretical teachings, the assembly condemned all the persons included in the letter of Pope Agatho, and added, "we anathematise also Honorius, formerly pope of old Rome, for we find in the letter, sent by him to Sergius, that he followed in everything the opinion of the latter, and that he sanctioned his impious teaching." There is nothing to lead us to suppose that the Roman legates protested against this decision, the gravest surely that was ever made by a regular council!

Even at Rome the authorities submitted. Pope Leo II, elected as successor to Agatho, sent in 682 a letter to the Basileus in which he fully approved the council. He explicitly anathematised the inventors of this new heresy, and with them "Honorius, who did not make the necessary effort to increase the glory of the Church by teaching apostolic doctrine, but who by an execrable act of treason permitted this Church without stain to be defiled." For a long time the annals of the Roman Church and certain liturgical books, used in the pontifical chapel, were to guard the memory of the condemnation inflicted by an œcumenical council and by a pope on another pope who had been guilty of negligence in the accomplishment of his apostolic charge, rather than of an error, properly speaking, of doctrine.

The sixth council with its condemnation of Monothelitism definitely closes the era of the great Christological controversies. These would not perhaps have lasted so long if a multitude of

questions, in general foreign to doctrine, had not intervened to complicate them. It would be a mistake to imagine that now, at the beginning of the Byzantine Middle Ages, they engrossed all the activity of religious thought. The considerable space allotted to them by the historian must not make us forget that during all this time the Church in the Byzantine Empire continued the work of the conquest of souls and the organisation of religious life. She completed the work of giving to her children that profound faith in supernatural truth, that intimate contact with the things of God, that veneration for the great Heavenly intercessors (especially for the "Panhagia" and the holy "Theotokos") which have remained so characteristic of Byzantine piety. The many convents raised everywhere were not all, needless to say, homes of fanaticism. The historian is bound to blame the culpable agitations, the useless violence, the opposition of a number of representatives of Byzantine monasticism to the official church, but we must not forget that in general in these "Lares" men prayed, mortified themselves and sanctified their souls, men, too, whose efforts God often crowned and of whom he made saints. And if the Basileus often ruled the Church too absolutely, if the "bishop outside" wished too often to judge of things within, he seldom lost sight of the great duties of his sacred office. From the beginning the Greek church had given to Constantine the title of "isapostolos" (the equal of the apostles). The successors of Constantine always had at heart the extension, even beyond their states, of the kingdom of the "Pantocrator" (the Almighty). From the fourth century on missioners worked throughout the whole extent of the Empire to spread the Kingdom

of Christ. The results did not, it is true, always correspond to the efforts. The evangelisation of the banks of the Danube and of Southern Russia was constantly compromised by the change of scene of which these regions were the theatre. That of Arabia was effaced slowly, and its results were destroyed by Mohammedanism. Distant Ethiopia, where the gospel penetrated in the fourth century, showed more resistance in its Christianity, but, through force of circumstances, it became merely a southern extension of the Coptic church. Even to the borders of the Sahara there was not a spot in Byzantine Africa which, after Justinian, had not attracted missioners.

In truth the "City crowned by God" did not show itself so unequal to its high destiny as has been made out.

The seventh century put an end to these brilliant efforts of the Byzantine apostolate. Mohammedanism arrested Christian expansion. It succeeded in submerging the oldest Christian communities, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria. It invaded new territories in the East and in Central Asia. Wherever it passed it hindered the gospel from penetrating. Besides, by making contact with the Latin West daily more difficult, it forced Byzance to fall back entirely upon itself. A day was to come when out of this barbarian West there would arise a new Christian Empire towards which the Church of Rome would naturally turn. Then, jealous of the fortune of this new parvenu, Byzance would definitely break the traditional bonds which linked the old and the new Rome.

Certainly a rupture was little thought of in 680, at that council at which the East exclaimed, "Peter

hath spoken by the mouth of Agatho," but the chequered pattern which at this time marked the religious map of the old Roman Empire bears testimony already to the new order of things which was in preparation. *Jam novus rerum nascitur ordo.*

Date Due

[illegible]			
✓ NOV 18	C/5/64		
JAN 13 '59 APR 18 '59	B600		
	B118		
	D1462 ✓		
DEC 18 '59	F1881		
JUN 8 '67			
FEB 19	1968		
FEB 18	1971 J.S.		
MAR 2 5	2008		

BOSTON COLLEGE
3 9031 01328353 6

160045

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Books may be kept for two weeks and may be renewed for the same period, unless reserved.

Two cents a day is charged for each book kept overtime.

If you cannot find what you want, ask the Librarian who will be glad to help you.

The borrower is responsible for books drawn on his card and for all fines accruing on the same.